ROOSEVELT EXPOSES SOCIALISM

Let no evil thing live.—Bible.

To that evil thing, Socialism, Roosevelt applies the only remedy—the axe.
Roosevelt will long be remembered for many things, but chiefly for the death-blow he dealt that home-destroying, anti-Christian and noxious foreign importation, Socialism.

—The Author.
OSCAR EDEL MAN

PREFACE

The many vicious, nonsensical and childish replies made by the "divide-up," "free-love," "scientific" (?) and other varieties of Socialists to Roosevelt's recent exposure of Socialism is enough to disgust any sane citizen.

In a recent series of articles Roosevelt laid bare the fallacies and society-destroying demands of modern Socialism.

Roosevelt, whom not only Americans, but the progressive people of all nations have learned to love, landed the Socialists a solar-plexus blow from which they will never recover.

Nor is Roosevelt alone in this effort to stamp out this noxious foreign idea of Socialism.

He is supported by bishops, priests, preachers, teachers and all patriotic, home-loving citizens of every land.

The replies to Roosevelt's article by the leading Socialists are so flimsy that I have used them freely as an antidote for the very principles Socialists seek to establish.

So great has been the demand for Roosevelt's latest articles against Socialism that I have decided to reproduce them in this booklet and trust that every justice-loving and patriotic citizen will give them the wide distribution they deserve.
ROOSEVELT EXPOSES SOCIALISM.

The following is Roosevelt's masterful article which has completely upset the Socialists.

"It is always difficult to discuss a question when it proves impossible to define the terms in which that question is to be discussed. Therefore there is not much to be gained by the discussion of Socialism versus Individualism in the abstract.

* * * * "Not so much as the first step toward real civilization can be taken until there arises some development of the right of private property; that is, until men pass out of the stage of savage Socialism in which the violent and the thriftless forcibly constitute themselves co-heirs with the industrious and the intelligent in what the labor of the latter produces. * * * *

With those self-styled Socialists to whom "Socialism" is merely a vaguely conceived catchword, and who use it to express their discontent with the existing wrongs and their purpose to correct them, there is not much need of discussion. But the real, logical, advanced Socialists, who teach their faith as both a creed and a party platform, may deceive to their ruin decent and well-meaning but shortsighted men; and there is need of plain speaking in order accurately to show the trend of their teaching.

One difficulty in arguing with professed Socialists of the extreme, or indeed of the opportunist type, however, is that those of them who are sincere almost invariably suffer from great looseness of thought; for if they did not keep their faith nebulous, it would at once become abhorrent in the eyes of all upright and sensible men.

The doctrinaire Socialists, the men who represent the doctrine in its most advanced form, are, and must necessarily be, not only convinced opponents of private property, but also bitterly hostile to religion and morality.

* * * * * * *

Indeed these thorough going Socialists occupy, in relation to all morality, and especially to domestic morality, a position so revolting—and I choose my words carefully—that it is difficult even to discuss it in a reputable paper.

* * * * * * *

In other words, the Socialists would replace the family and home life by a glorified state free-lunch counter and state foundling asylum, deliberately enthroning self-indulgence as the ideal, with the absolute abandonment of all morality as between man and woman.
Socialists prate of equality yet if their party in America should today endeavor to force their followers to admit all negroes and Chinamen to a real equality, their party would promptly disband.

* * * * * * *

"When Socialism of this really advanced and logical type is tried as it was in France in 1792 and again in 1871, it is inevitable that the movement, ushered in with every kind of high-sounding phrase, should rapidly spread so as to include, not merely the forcible acquisition of the property of others, but every conceivable form of momentary corruption, immorality, licentiousness, and murderous violence. In theory, distinctions can be drawn between this kind of Socialism and Anarchy and Nihilism; but in practice, as in 1871, there is no difference between Anarchy and Socialism.

"There are dreadful woes in modern life, dreadful suffering among millions of those who toil, brutal wrong-doing among some of those who make colossal fortunes by exploiting the toilers. It is the duty of every honest and upright man, of every man who holds within his breast the capacity for righteous indignation, to recognize these wrongs, and to strive with all his might, to bring about a better condition of things. But he will never bring about this betterment by misstating facts and advocating remedies which are not merely false, but fatal."

From the above we learn that Roosevelt is a profound student of political problems. His frank and open admission that many wrongs exist and must be remedied, together with his heroic and self-sacrificing efforts during the past ten years to bring about a "square deal" for ALL, is the one live topic in progressive circles today.

In recognition of his phenomenal accomplishments Roosevelt, during his recent trip, was paid a higher tribute by the masses abroad than any other private or public man whoever lived.

Roosevelt's reception abroad was not only a recognition of his sterling worth, unimpeachable honesty and force of character, but the joyful and spontaneous manner in which he was welcomed back to his native country was a tribute of love which would have done honor to a Napoleon.

That America still rears pin-headed and jealous mortals, who though posing as editors, nevertheless stab genius at every opportunity, is illustrated by the following
taken from the Johnstown Daily Democrat of June 24, 1910:

"ROOSEVELT'S PLEA FOR JUSTICE.

"That a large proportion of the American people have not the remotest conception of political liberty and its duties and responsibilities was amply demonstrated by the reception tendered Theodore Roosevelt, the tremendous advocate of the exercise of force and injustice in the government of subject peoples, on his return home after a year's absence in the wilds of Africa.

"It is not long ago when any representative American, not to speak of successors of Jefferson, Jackson and Lincoln, who should seriously advocate government without the consent of the governed would be denounced from one end of the land to the other as a detestable traitor to the principles upon which his government was founded. Instead of the reception that greeted Mr. Roosevelt there would be an indignant and outraged people forcibly reminding him that the spirit that animated and inspired the heroes of 1776 is not extinct and that the ideas of popular government which actuated the founders of the American republic are still loved, honored and respected.

"It is only a little more than a decade since we entered our imperial policy of governing subject peoples against their will; and we have made such rapid strides in the direction of despotism that a former president of the foremost republic on earth presumes to instruct the greatest of despotic powers how to govern a people without their consent. 'In such a situation as yours in Egypt,' said Mr. Roosevelt at Guildhall, London, 'timidity, weakness, sentimentality, may cause even more far-reaching harm than violence and injustice.'

It would be difficult for Mr. Roosevelt to point a single instance in his own or historical times when violence and injustice improved the condition of the people, developed the power of self-government or advanced civilization a single step. The very contrary is the fact. It is the essential nature of injustice that it cannot benefit anyone.

The experience of mankind has amply demonstrated that injustice cannot benefit the nation that inflicts it nor the nation that suffers it. All other stars may be eccentric, but this is the north star in the political firmament by the light of which all progressive nations may steer.

The annals of every nation bear witness that every government, be it ever so good, cannot be a substitute for self-
government. To manifest confidence in the people is one of the best ways to prepare them for the duties of citizenship. If injustice and violence are justifiable in a government of a subject people, then George III and Lord North were right and the revolutionary fathers were wrong. It would indeed be difficult for a former president of the American republic to make a more humiliating exhibition for the gayety of despotic nations than did Mr. Roosevelt when he stood in Guildhall, London, berating the British people because their government of the Egyptians was tempered with justice and moderation. And to realize that such a personification of violence and injustice is said to be the most popular man in America! We certainly have fallen on degenerate times."

To further show the contemptible means used to belittle Roosevelt's honest effort to rid society of its many evils, read the following which appeared in the leading Socialist paper in the United States, the Appeal to Reason ("Treason" would be more appropriate) of Girard, Kansas.

Follows the article:

"The Outlook, of which Theodore Roosevelt is now one of the editors and in which he made his bow by launching a savage attack on Socialism, is an ultra capitalistic publication. One of its principal stockholders is James Stillman, known as the silent man of the Standard Oil Company, who is also president of the City National Bank, the Rockefeller institution of New York and the business associate of Rockefeller and Harriman and other "malefactors of wealth," whom Roosevelt affected to denounce with righteous wrath in the name of an offended people.

It is entirely consistent that Roosevelt is now in the editorial employ of one of its "malefactors of great wealth." He has always been in their service for that matter, and they always furnished his campaign funds, but the fact of Stillman being a stockholder of the Outlook Company, which only casually came to light, lifts his mask and places him where he properly belongs. Of course Mr. Stillman has a perfect right to own stock in the Outlook. We have not the least objection. The only point is that being a stockholder indicates the true character of the Outlook. He would not own stock in it if its policy did not suit him, if it did not accord with his interests as "a rich malefactor. Mr. Stillman does not own stock in the Appeal to Reason (no sane man would want to). "A straw shows which way the wind blows."

Nothing could be more economically consistent and at
the same time more significant and illuminating than for Theodore Roosevelt, the trust busting demagogue in the service of a magazine owned in part and controlled wholly by the Standard Oil Company, to attack Socialism with all his savage fury at a dollar a word paid to him by the "rich malefactors" who are robbing the American people."

Could greater discredit be cast upon a man than this same Appeal slur? What if the Standard Oil Company does own the Outlook, aren't all the papers and magazines owned by the Standard Oil crowd or other thrifty and therefore wealthy people? What does it matter who owns the paper so long as one's honest opinions are expressed? No one doubts that these are Roosevelt's honest opinions. Is it any wonder that several attempts have been made by the post-office department to suppress this anarchistic sheet, the Appeal to Reason?

**THE DEAD-LEVEL OFSOCIALISM.**

God created the people unequal, yet the Socialists would abolish both the divine and natural law and reduce all to a dead level of mediocrity. Roosevelt takes them to task as follows:

"These same Socialist leaders, with a curious effrontery, at times deny that the exponents of "scientific Socialism" assume a position as regards industry which in condensed form may be stated as, that each man is to do what work he can, or, in other words, chooses, and in return is to take out from the common fund whatever he needs; or, what amounts to the same thing, that each man shall have equal remuneration with every other man, no matter what work is done."

This is, to say the least, too hot for the Socialists, but Morris Hillquit thinks he is clear-headed enough to straighten it out as follows:

"But what then, may be asked, is the Socialist plan of distribution of wealth?"

"The plain answer to this question is: The Socialists do not offer a cut and dried plan of wealth distribution."

This exactly proves Roosevelt's contention, viz: That the Socialists are asking the people to change from capitalism to Socialism while admitting that they can't tell what it will look like when they get it.

"As a proposition of abstract justice and fairness there is no reason why any discrimination at all should be made in the distribution of the necessaries and material comforts of life between the members of the community. The in-
creased productivity of labor and the consequent augmentation of wealth are due to the concerted efforts of men in all fields of endeavor, physical and mental, in generations past as well as present, and the precise share of each individual in the general wealth of the nation is altogether insusceptible of measurement.

"It must be granted that some individuals are stronger, wiser, more gifted and skillful than others. But what of that? Is there any moral ground for punishing the cripple, the invalid, the decrepit, the imbecile, the unfortunate step-children of nature, by reducing their rations of food or clothing? Is there any moral sanction for rewarding the man of physical strength or mental gifts by special allowances from the storehouse of human society? Do humane parents discriminate in that manner between their strong and weak, their fortunate and unfortunate children? Is the title of the stronger and "abler" to greater material reward based on equity, or is it rather a survival of the barbaric 'first right' of the dark ages?

"To the Socialists of the OLD communistic motto: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs,' generally appears as the ideal rule of distribution in an enlightened human society, and quite likely the time will come when the high standard will be generally adopted by civilized communities.

"The productivity of labor is increasing with such phenomenal rapidity that we may well foresee a time when society will, with comparative ease, produce enough to afford to all its members, without distinction, all necessaries and even luxuries of life, and when there will be just as little justification for a quarrel over the method of distribution of material wealth as there is today for a quarrel over the use of air or water. To the wise skeptics the statement may seem extravagant, but when we compare the wealth and productivity of modern countries today (twenty times) with those of half a century ago, we shall easily realize that we are by no means dealing with pure Utopian dreams.

"But just and feasible as this ideal method of distribution may be, it is today nevertheless a mere ideal, a hope to be realized in the more or less distant future. IT IS NOT A PART OF THE PRESENT PROGRAM OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT.

"Modern Socialists recognize that the methods of distribution under the new order of things must take for their starting-point the present methods, i. e., payments of
varying wages or salaries for services rendered.

"Money and wages are both the products of a certain phase of economic development. Neither was known before the rise of private property, and in all likelihood both will at some time in the distant future lose their usefulness and disappear. But these reflections again belong to the sphere of dreams of the golden future,—they have no room in a sober and realistic program of social reform."

Could a dream be more nebulous than the above? Would you vote for a system that can't be outlined?
ROOSEVELT AND THE "MULE MAN."

The above cut representing Socialism chopping down the mighty tree of Capitalism shows to what extremes the Socialists would go if given a chance.

Roosevelt, as elsewhere quoted, admits that capitalism bears more evil and corrupt fruit. All other thinkers and humanitarians must and do admit as much and more. Many a tree has been saved by proper pruning. This, Roosevelt and his noble band of progressives propose to do and thus save capitalism and society. Socialists would cut down and thus utterly destroy the tree. The crux of the Socialist remedy is, "if your tooth aches, cut off your head." Roosevelt's remedy is, "treat the tooth, fill it, and thus save it as a part of the system of mastication.

In this connection I quote from the author of "Men and Mules" who loves to rid himself of this choice piece of bombast by quoting from Lincoln the following:

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching that unnerves me, and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country. As a result of war, corporations have been enthroned, and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people, until all the wealth is aggregated in a few hands, and the republic is destroyed."

The "Mule" man then proceeds with the following gush:

Who made the above statement? Abe Lincoln. When? In 1863 in the midst of the great war. What did he mean? He meant that the Republican party having freed the slaves would naturally become very popular and under cover of that popularity would permit the money power to establish monopolies and trusts until the entire wealth of the nation would be in the hands of a few people. The masses took heed of Lincoln's warning and immediately shifted from the Republican to the Democratic party and elected Samuel J. Tilden to the presidency, but he was counted out. Then the people said, "We'll go back to the Republicans again and give them a thorough trial to see what they really will do." But still the wealth kept on drifting into the hands of a few. Then they shifted back again from the Republicans to Democrats and elected Grover Cleveland. Still no remedy. Then they shifted back to Republicans and elected B. Harrison. Still things kept on getting worse. Again the people turned in droves to the Democrats and elected
Cleveland for the second time. Their slogan was: “Grover, Grover, four more years of clover,” but before they got through with Grover they had soup-houses and bread lines until you could not see the end of them, didn’t they? The people in their desperation shifted back to the Republicans and when McKinley died Theodore Roosevelt took up the task of stopping the money power and trusts from gobbling the earth. For nearly eight long years this Republican Teddy kept after the trusts. He had the advantage of a Republican congress, a Republican senate, a Republican supreme court—he had the army and navy—the newspapers, and above all perhaps eighty per cent of the people were with him in his gigantic fight to curb the trusts. The papers had Teddy cartooned smashing the oil trust today, the sugar trust tomorrow, the beef trust the next day, and some days Teddy had several trusts killed before breakfast.

Yes, for eight years Teddy had you fellows cheering and yelling yourselves into hysterics over his success. But when Teddy stepped down and out and the dust and smoke cleared away you fool voters beheld that the trusts were all still there, had grown from mere saplings to monster giants; all doing business at the same old stand with prices higher than ever. Now, honest to God, isn’t it so? Haven’t you voting donkeys for the past fifty years shifted from one party to another in the hopes of busting the trusts? And you haven’t accomplished anything, have you? And why haven’t you? Because for the past fifty years you only changed parties. You did not change systems. It is the system that is at fault. There are and can be but TWO systems of handling capital: The one under which we now do business called Capitalism, the other under which we propose to do business called Socialism. Capitalism means private ownership of capital. Socialism means public or collective ownership of capital of the means of production and distribution.

The Republicans and Democrats, both stand for private ownership. Therefore, when you shift from Republican to Democrat and vice versa, you change parties but do not change systems. It is notorious that the old parties, and even reform parties, stand for the same system fundamentally—in fact they stand so close together and are so ROTTEN that if one of them died, I’ll be darned, if it wouldn’t stink the other one to death.

The facts are, the capitalists keep the two old parties in the field for their own especial benefit. When the one party becomes too rank to endure they trot out the other
to catch your votes. To still further deceive you they frequently launch other reform and fake parties, "Golden Rule" outfits, etc., and of course like real suckers you swallow bait, hook, sinker and all.

Candidly, if either or both of the old parties really wished to prevent graft and accomplish the destruction of trusts, why haven’t they done so? Haven’t they both had complete control of the government in all its departments? If they haven’t, who has? The old parties, for the past half century have had the power, and having done worse than nothing, isn’t this proof that they did not want to do anything? Is it possible that the trusts are greater than the government and that we are ruled by the trusts?

If that’s the case we are not living under a republic but an oligarchy. Evidently the old parties have wanted an oligarchy and are they not therefore traitors to our country? Do you consider it patriotic to vote for either of these parties, considering the above facts? Isn’t it a fact that all the candidates of the old parties are furnished or O. K.’d by the trusts and other monied interests?

Isn’t it also a fact that the Socialist party is of, by and for the working class and don’t they advocate the initiative, referendum and recall and isn’t it a fact that then and only then will the people rule because then they could make or unmake any law they wanted? By the way, did you ever see in the platform of either of the old parties a DEMAND for the initiative and referendum? Of course not—not a word. Well then doesn’t that plainly show that neither old party believes in letting the people rule?

Then why don’t you fool voters—you Democrats and Republicans of the working class vote with your own crowd, the Socialists? They have always advocated the initiative, referendum and recall. Get some one to kick you, you voting donkeys, with the hopes of jarring your brains into action.”

Is it not evident to any thinking man that such scurrilous speeches as the "Mule Man" aims at the two old parties in his defense of Socialism act as a boomerang upon Socialism?

CORRUPTION UNDER SOCIALISM—BY THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

"The natural tendency, and in fact the inevitability of corruption under Socialism, is pointed out by Roose
velt in the following and convincing language:

"Under this modern Socialism, therefore, or communism, which is the same thing, the government would have to be the worst possible despotism; a despotism so drastic that its realization would only be an ideal. Of course in practice such a system would not work at all; and incidentally the mere attempt to realize it would necessarily be accompanied by a corruption so gross that the blackest spot of corruption in any existing form of city government would seem bright by comparison."

To this unanswerable argument the best the Socialists have to offer is the following gauzy rebuttal:

"Graft and corruption will be unknown under Socialism because the people will at all times have recourse to the initiative, referendum and recall. These are simply terms for direct legislation—that is, for giving the people direct power to initiate (start) good legislation and direct power to veto (stop) bad legislation.

The initiative and referendum are not intended to displace representative government, nor to do away with legislatures. They are intended to act as checks or balance wheels during the course of legislation. Instead of the legislature or the governor being the final arbiter on important laws, the people at large are given that power, if they care to exercise it.

Through the INITIATIVE a certain percentage of voters may suggest a law and the suggestion is a mandate to the legislature. Through the referendum the approval of a certain percentage of voters is necessary before an important measure finally becomes a law. Thus the people have the means by which they can at any time override the legislature, but the legislature can never override the people.

In practice it has invariably been found that in those cities, states and nations where the Initiative, Referendum and Recall are in force the law making bodies pass more good and fewer bad laws than in those places where direct legislation is not in force. Corruption and bribery ceases automatically when the voters have the power to kill immediately any law they do not want and put in its stead the very law they do want. For this reason law makers and other public officials do better work and give closer heed to public sentiment and implicitly enact into laws what the public demands.

The Recall means that the people have the power to
recall any public official or servant and place in his stead
the man they want.

"Yes, but aren't you Socialists made of ordinary clay
and just as likely to accept a bribe as are the officials of
other parties? Sure, we are ordinary humans, yet I shall
prove to you that it will be impossible to betray the inter-
est of the people.

To illustrate, suppose under Socialism Rockefeller de-
sires me, a socialist legislator, to pass a certain law which
would be against the people and benefit him at least $50,-
000,000.00 per year. Suppose further, that I am willing
to feather my own nest by accepting a million dollar bribe
for my vote. Would Rockefeller be fool enough to hand
me the million when he knows that through the recall
and referendum the people could call me back to private
life and absolutely annul the whole deal?

Under Socialism ten per cent of the voters, by petition,
can bring the Initiative, Referendum and Recall into action.

For this reason every trust magnate, every capitalist
every child-labor employer, and every big party politician is
fighting Socialism to the death.

"If the Initiative, Referendum and Recall will do all
you Socialists claim, how does it happen that all plutocrats
and corrupt politicians, to a man, are in favor of 'The com-
mission form of government?' Because all the power is
placed in the hands of a few officials and the Initiative, Ref-
erendum and Recall cannot be used until 75 per cent of the
voters sign a petition. It would be as easy to remove a czar
or an emperor as to get 75 per cent of the voters of a nation
to sign such a petition.

Millions upon millions of wage-slaves dare not express
their political opinions for fear of losing their jobs. Do
you imagine for a minute that you could get 75 per cent
of these poor workers who have wives and little ones to
provide for and who depend upon the capitalists for a job
to parade their signature upon a petition which might in
some way interfere with the sacred profits of their em-
ployer.

The capitalists are for the commission form of govern-
ment because it puts the law MAKING and law INFORCE-
ing power into the hands of three or four people whom they
hope to bribe; and because they know it is impossible to get
75 per cent or even 40 per cent of the voters to sign a peti-
tion.

Look out for any measure that the capitalists freely
offer the workers. In the end all capitalist proposals to
help the poor turn out to be chains to further enslave the masses. The commission form of government is just such a scheme. It is nothing else.

As showing that Direct Legislation will do what is claimed for it by the Socialists, they cite the following:

"The street car monopoly in Kansas City arranged with the council to get a 26-year extension of their franchise, the present one having sixteen years yet to run. It was easy sailing so far as the council was concerned, but when the ordinance was submitted to the voters, it was snoozed under overwhelmingly, every ward in the city giving a big majority against the extension. The lesson to be learned is this: That a few men elected to office can be bribed but you cannot bribe the whole electorate. The people can be trusted if they can vote directly upon a proposition. The majority cannot be bribed, because they are too many, and the bribe would have to be repeated so often that it would recoil on the bribers and cost so much that no franchise or other special privilege would be worth the expenditure. Direct Legislation would purify politics. Those who make a business of politics would have to go to work for an honest living, if the people voted directly on the laws.

The Capitalists, politicians and all others who live from rent, interest, profit or graft know full well what is best for themselves and therefore they vote for old parties and for such monstrous fakes as commission form of government. "Are you wage earners fools enough to vote with them? If so, you deserve slavery."

ROOSEVELT CLUBS THE SOCIALISTS WITH THEIR OWN PLATFORM.

I submit the Socialist platform as being the best evidence that Roosevelt was correct when he stated that Socialism means, "Dividing up," "Free love," Gross immorality," etc. The platform proves explicitly all of Roosevelt's charges —nay, it catches the Socialists with the goods on 'em.

PRINCIPLES.

Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

Today the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the source of life of others. But when machin-
ery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires for its effective operation the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employing workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of the industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental labor power—the wage worker—or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—the small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country’s industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessaries of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominant parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the
executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own—and censor the press. They dominate the educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society. The small farmer, who is today exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built; political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestige of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation.

There can be no absolute private title to land. All private titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, are and must be subordinate to the public title. The Socialist Party strives to prevent land from being used for the purpose of exploitation and speculation. It demands the collective possession, control or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. It is not opposed to the occupation and possession of land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation.

The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of all modern workers are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist Party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist Party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory, to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.
As measures calculated to strengthen the working class in its fight for the realization of this ultimate aim, and to increase its power of resistance against capitalist oppression, we advocate and pledge ourselves and our elected officers to the following program:

**General Demands.**

1—The immediate government relief for the unemployed workers by building schools, by reforesting of cut-over and waste lands, by reclamation of arid tracts, and the building of canals, and by extending all other useful public works. All persons employed on such works shall be employed directly by the government under an eight-hour work-day and at the prevailing union wages. The government shall also loan money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works. It shall contribute to the funds of labor organizations for the purpose of assisting their unemployed members, and shall take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

2—The collective ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamboat lines and all other means of social transportation and communication.

3—The collective ownership of all industries which are organized on a national scale and in which competition has virtually ceased to exist.

4—The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water power.

5—The scientific reforestation of timber lands, and the reclamation of swamp lands. The land so reforested or reclaimed to be permanently retained as a part of the public domain.

6—The absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage.

**Industrial Demands.**

7—The improvement of the industrial condition of the workers.

(a) By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

(b) By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

(c) By securing a more effective inspection of workshops and factories.

(d) By forbidding the employment of children under sixteen years of age.

(e) By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child labor, of convict labor and of all uninspected factories.

(f) By abolishing official charity and substituting in its place compulsory insurance against unemployment, illness, accidents, invalidism, old age and death.

**Political Demands.**

8—The extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the amount of the bequests and to the nearness of kin.

9—A graduated income tax.

10—Unrestricted and equal suffrage for men and women, and we pledge ourselves to engage in an active campaign in that direction.

11—The initiative and referendum, proportional representation and the right of recall.

12—The abolition of the senate.
13—The abolition of the power usurped by the supreme court of the United States to pass upon the constitutionality of legislation enacted by Congress. National laws to be repealed or abrogated only by act of Congress or by a referendum of the whole people.

14—That the constitution be made amendable by majority vote.

15—The enactment of further measures for general education and for the conservation of health. The bureau of education to be made a department. The creation of a department of public health.

16—The separation of the present bureau of labor from the department of commerce and labor, and the establishment of a department of labor.

17—That all judges be elected by the people for short terms, and that the power to issue injunctions shall be curbed by immediate legislation.

18—The free administration of justice.

Such measures of relief as we may be able to force from capitalism are but a preparation of the workers to seize the whole power of government in order that they may thereby lay hold of the whole system of industry and thus come to their rightful inheritance.

COMMENTS ON SOCIALIST PLATFORM.

Having read the above Socialist Platform, (the platform of Socialists the world over is in substance the same) it is sheer gall on their part to deny Roosevelt's charges.

With the nerve of a modern trust magnate, the Socialists attempt to distort the plain statements made in their platform and deliberately attempt to stir up discontent and deceive the great mass of happy and contented workers.

The following is a sample of the arguments the Socialists use to bolster up their dreamy platform:

"Socialism when completed will be an industrial democracy. But Socialism now is a movement that is ruled democratically. Republicans and Democrats adopt their platform in convention, and the masses of voters have to stand for it, whether they like it or not. But Socialists adopt their platform by referendum vote, each plank being voted on separately by the party membership—that is, the dues-paying members.

The Socialist platform boiled down means simply this: "What the people use in common they should own in common, and what they use privately they should own privately." In other words it means that everything through which rent, interest or profit can be made shall at once become public property, the same as the public schools, parks, fire department, etc.

Under Socialism all other property, such as homes, pianos, automobiles, furniture, etc., shall as now continue
to remain private property to be used and enjoyed as the owner may see fit. Socialism is, therefore, strictly a bread and butter proposition. It has absolutely nothing to do with "religion," "free love" or "dividing up." We Socialists contend that our principles have been grossly misrepresented by the plutocrats and their hirelings. Especially have the newspapers lied about our movement. We Socialists understand full well that if the newspapers told the truth about Socialism they would lose all their advertising instantly. We Socialists realize that the great bulk of the people gain their knowledge through the columns of the newspapers.

Is it any wonder then that the average person is prejudiced against Socialism?

Let us for a moment consider what chance there would be under Socialism for the introduction and operation of "free love," "dividing up," etc.

Elsewhere in this booklet we find that ten per cent of the people can, by petition, under Socialism initiate or start any law they wish and compel it to be voted upon. Suppose further that the ten per cent should propose a law for "free love" and to abolish all religion. Promptly these demands are submitted to a vote of all the people. This means that the Socialists, together with the non-Socialists could vote directly upon these proposed laws. Would YOU vote for it? If you would not, if a majority of the people would not vote for these things, they could not be adopted. It would be impossible.

Now suppose, for the sake of argument that a majority would vote for free love, or the abolishment of religion, how do you suppose such a law could be enforced? Could you be forced to give up your religion and become an Atheist? Experience has shown that such things are impossible and Socialists are not big enough fools to make any such attempts. Indeed, if you will consider, you must see that the very charge that such an attempt would be made is absolutely silly and ought to fall to the ground of itself.

How in the world can the giving of power to YOU, the people to rule industry and your own lives, which is the sole and only thing that Socialism proposes, cause you to do something which you would not want to do?"

**ROOSEVELT AND THE HOME.**

To Roosevelt's charge that Socialism will break up the home, the Socialists reply as follows:

"It would be impossible for us Socialists to break up
the homes of 82 per cent of the people because census reports show that over three-fourths of the people do not own homes. It's a cinch we can't destroy homes that don't exist. 96 per cent of the people in New York City do not own homes, 91 per cent of the people in Chicago don't own their homes, 89 per cent of the people in Philadelphia don't own their homes either, while other cities are but little better.

What does "home" mean to the three million children and seven million women who work in factories and sweatshops long weary hours for a mere pittance?

What does "home" mean to the three million men who are constantly out of work and tramping from place to place looking for a "job?"

What does "home" mean to the one million two hundred thousand prostitutes—women who are forced to sell their virtue for a crust of bread?

What does "home" mean to the millions of women who are forced to marry for the sake of enough to eat and wear?

What does "home" mean to the ninety-five thousand people who are divorced each year, largely because of wage slavery as it exists under Capitalism?

What does "home" mean to the one hundred and thirty-five thousand families in New York City who, yearly, together with their household goods, are thrown into the streets because they cannot pay their rent?

What does "home" mean to the one million widows with small children and babies to care for? What does "home" mean to the millions of children who are orphaned because their "daddies" were killed in mills and mines while piling up profits for idlers?

Socialism will break up the home will it? Guess again.

Instead of Socialism breaking up the home it will enable the people to secure and enjoy a home. And it will do this for the following reasons:

Since the average skilled mechanic produces $2,471 worth of goods per year and receives in wages but $437 (this is according to census bulletin No. 150) he is robbed of the difference, or $2,034. This $437, his wage, is not enough upon which to live decently. Therefore his wife and children are compelled to work for any old wage in order to help out with expenses. This is one reason why women and children are in factories instead of in the
home or in school. How is a man to acquire a "home" when he hasn't wages enough to live respectably?

Under Socialism the workers would get all they produce. Today the workers get one-sixth of all they produce. Roosevelt says the workers will all have homes if they get only one-sixth, but would be homeless if they got all they produced. How do you like Theodore's argument?

It is the system of private ownership that is at fault, and not the individual.

It is a mighty queer argument, Mr. Roosevelt, to contend that because Socialism would give a man ALL he earns or $2,471 instead of $437 (one-sixth of what he produces) that he would immediately bust up his home, and degenerate into an "undesirable citizen."

Continuing your same line of argument, Mr. Roosevelt all that is necessary to increase morality and virtue is to REDUCE wages and when wages get down to water and thin air, a working man would be a second edition of Jesus Christ. Oh! you Teddy.

Evidently that's the program, because the Capitalists whom you, Mr. Roosevelt, represent are doing everything in their power to reduce wages. To this end they bust up the union and encourage foreign immigration; they pit the mother against the father and the child against both father and mother. That's what the SYSTEM does, and you are upholding it."

ROOSEVELT—LABOR'S FRIEND.

That Roosevelt is working for the best interests of the wage workers is clearly shown in his own language.

"I wish it to be remembered that I speak from the standpoint of, and on behalf of the wage-worker and the tiller of the soil. These are the two men whose welfare I have ever before me, and for their sakes I would do anything, except anything that is wrong."

To this the Socialists reply with a lot of words, MEANINGLESS WORDS.

"Mr. Roosevelt if you are really in favor of the wage earner why did you, while governor of New York send the troops to Croton Dam to crush the men who were at that time on strike to have the state law regulating the hours of labor enforced, and thus assist the rich contractor in violating the law?

When Moyer, Haywood, and Pettibone were on trial for their lives, why did you decnounce them as guilty and "undesirable citizens," and send out the national troops to
crush out the Western Federation of Miners which these men represented? Didn’t a court trial prove these men innocent of the crime charged against them? Then, Mr. Roosevelt, why didn’t you have the manhood and honesty to come out with an apology? Is it because you love labor? Why did you settle the great coal strike in such a manner that the coal barons insist on making the terms of settlement permanent? Visit the rented shanties occupied by the coal miners as well as the palaces of the coal trust barons, Mr. Roosevelt, and you have the answer. Volumes could be written, Mr. Roosevelt, to show that you have always stood for the CAPITALIST CLASS as against the WORKING CLASS.

And now, my dear Roosevelt, isn’t it a fact that there are and can be but TWO SYSTEMS of handling productive capital—the ONE private ownership, the OTHER public ownership—Socialism? Since you are FIGHTING Socialism you must necessarily UPHOLD capitalism. It is capitalism, through its supporters such as you who are everywhere crushing labor. You, Mr. Roosevelt, by pretending to favor the working class, while crushing labor at every opportunity are really hand in glove with the politicians who are working out the following plan which recently appeared in the Bankers’ Magazine:

"We must proceed with caution and guard well every move made, for the lower orders of the people are already showing signs of restless commotion. Prudence will, therefore, dictate a policy of apparently yielding to the popular will until all our plans are so far consummated that we can declare our designs without fear of any organized resistance.

"The Farmers’ Alliance and Knights of Labor organization in the United States should be carefully watched by our trusted men, and we must take immediate steps to control these organizations in our interest or disrupt them.

"At the coming Omaha convention to be held July 4th, our men must attend and direct its movements, or else there will be set on foot such antagonism to our designs as may require force to overcome.

"This, at the present time, would be premature. We are not yet ready for such a crisis. Capital must protect itself in every possible manner through combination and legislation.

"The courts must be called to our aid, debts must be collected, bonds and mortgages foreclosed as rapidly as possible."
"When, through a process of law, the common people have lost their homes, they will be more tractable and easily governed through the influence of the strong arm of government applied by a central power of imperial wealth under the control of leading financiers. A people without homes will not quarrel with their rulers.

"History repeats itself in regular cycles. This truth is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of capital to govern the world. While they are doing this the people must be kept in a condition of political antagonism.

"The question of tariff reform must be urged through the organization known as the democratic party, and the question of protection with reciprocity must be forced to view through the republican party.

"By thus dividing the voters we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance to us except as teachers to lead the common herd. Thus by discreet action we can secure all that has been so generously planned and successfully accomplished."

Yes, Mr. Roosevelt, it is just such double dealing, would-be "reformers" as you that enables the Capitalist to fasten upon the people their system quoted above.

You are the one great power in the employ of capitalism, talking and writing at a dollar a word (The Outlook Magazine, owned by the Standard Oil crowd, pays Roosevelt one dollar per word) in favor of a system which is wrong, because wasteful; because it develops servility, hatred, untruthfulness, cunning, trickery, oppression—everything but the ideal character of a Christian gentleman; because it produces reckless luxury on the one hand, and untold misery on the other; because it creates ignorance, disease, crime; because it creates antagonism instead of social cohesion; because it neutralizes the industrial forces, and because it creates a feverish force in some men, not for the sake of useful labor, but for victory over their fellows. It devitalizes the very nerve of energy by depriving laborers of all interest in their work. Competition puts millions into the pockets of an ignorant, idle dude, and loads his splendid, industrious neighbors with misfortune and debt. It builds the slums of cities and the hate engendering palaces of the rich. It has given us a standard of value and a division of labor that sacrifices manhood to merchandise. It gives activity and growth to all that is hard, combative, unscrupulous and unsympathetic in man and hinders the development of brotherly love, helpfulness, truthfulness and
public spirit. It rewards injurious activities, and gives some of the highest prizes as premiums for wrongs, dishonesties, oppressions and injustices. It is destructive of liberty and individuality, as well as of virtue and comfort; it ruins men, body and soul. It condemns vast numbers of children to a birthright of misery, disease and sin. It periodically disturbs the nation's industries with flurries and panics. It gives the keys of the world's wealth to Wall street gamblers. It wastes five-sixths of the industrial forces of the world. It has given us a distorted civilization, in which one per cent of the people own more than three-fifths of the wealth, five per cent are pernicious or useless, ten per cent insufficiently nourished, fifty per cent unjustly treated, receiving less of power and wealth than is their due, and ninety per cent insufficiently and improperly educated. It prevents the survival of the fittest. . . Competition is the insanity of the past and the colossal crime of the present.

You certainly stand for a great moral (?) system, don't you, Mr. Roosevelt? Your love(?) for the "wage-earner" and "earth-tiller" is unbounded. The good old Republican party that you stand for loves the working man so much that it is sending out through the United States Labor Bureau a circular advertising the desirability of Mexican peon labor in the United States. This is done in the bulletin which is being distributed among American capitalists. Along with the bulletin is sent a blank application for workers, which the bureau proposes to supply. The sample application is sent FREE through the mails. Here are some extracts from the bulletin which advertises peon labor.

"His strongest point is his willingness to work for a low wage.

"Railroad men dispute the charge that Mexican laborers are dishonest in the payment of their debts, and seem to feel kindly toward them on account of declaring for their rights without starting strikes or inciting disorders.

"The Mexican laborer is preferred to the negro, except for rush work, where the men labor long hours.

"The men do quite well far north in the United States, where the winters are very severe. The opinion is expressed that this is owing to the fact that they are better fed and housed."

This, Mr. Roosevelt, is what your party—with your appointee, Mr. Taft, at the helm—is doing for the dear "wage-earner" and the "earth-tiller" whom you love.

Nor is this all your party is doing for the captains of
industry. Your party is sending out the following cards:

"The division of information is authorized by act of congress to promote the beneficial distribution of admitted aliens and other persons seeking employment. All persons who desire necessary help (farm laborers, common laborers, mechanics, etc.) should obtain an application blank by detaching and mailing the attached card (which requires no postage) indicating thereon the kind of labor needed. No charge is made or fee accepted, either from employer or employee."

Observe these points: It is free. It is providing common laborers, which means non-union men; it is getting jobs for admitted aliens, but not for Americans.

Mr. Roosevelt, you are and always have been of, by and for the capitalist class. You are their spokesman. You cannot use "the short and ugly word" fast enough to deny this charge. Your every official act proves it. We have caught you with the goods on you. Oh! you labor lover!

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS.

"Every far-sighted patriot should protest, first of all, against the growth in this country of that evil thing which is called 'class consciousness.' The demagogue, the sinister or foolish Socialist visionary, who strives to arouse this feeling of class consciousness in our working people, does a foul and evil thing, for he is no true American, he is no self-respecting citizen of this republic; he forfeits his right to stand with manly self-reliance on a footing of entire equality with all other citizens, who bows to envy and greed, who erects the doctrine of class hatred into a shibboleth, who substitutes loyalty to men of a particular status, whether rich or poor, for loyalty to those eternal and immutable principles of righteousness which bid us treat each man on his own worth as a man without regard to his wealth or his poverty."—Theodore Roosevelt in special message to congress.

Roosevelt takes the position that the interests of capital and labor are identical.

In this he is supported by every clear thinking patriot. Samuel Gompers, John Mitchell, Seth Low, August Belmont, Rockefeller and all other good and successful men are with him.

The keystone of the Socialist philosophy is the "class struggle."

The attempt of the Socialists to shatter Roosevelt's argument with the "class struggle" is equivalent to a billy
goat trying to batter down the Washington monument. The following is a sample of their best:

There exist today two industrial classes, viz: the Capitalist Class and the Working Class. There is not and never can be any "community of interests" between these two classes. One buys labor power; the other sells labor power. Their interests are totally and absolutely at variance.

The average skilled mechanic produces on an average $2,471.00 worth of goods per year and receives in wages but $437.00. The difference between the two amounts, $2,034.00, is consumed largely through rent, interest and profit, and falls into the laps of idlers—the capitalists.

"The class struggle" centers right here.

The wage earners are striving to get larger wages.

The capitalists are trying constantly to get larger profits.

If the workers' wages are increased, the capitalists' share must be decreased. If the capitalist's share is increased, the wage-earners' share is decreased. The total amount to be divided between the workers and capitalists is just so much (a fixed amount, $2,471.00), and if one class gets more the other class gets less. When one gains the other loses. Any person who can't understand that should be examined for sanity.

If this isn't true, why do the capitalists try to get laws in their favor, and why do the workers try to get laws in favor of the workers?

Yes indeed, we Socialists affirm the "class struggle." We Socialists did not invent it—we simply point it out.

"The class struggle" is accurately reflected in the strike, the lockout and riot. Anything that would benefit one class would harm the other. This is self-evident.

The workers want high wages and short hours, while the capitalists want the exact opposite.

Mr. Roosevelt, in all your speeches you assert that there are no classes in this country. About five minutes later in the same speech you say it is wrong for the Socialists to "stir up classes." How can we stir up classes, Mr. Roosevelt, if there are none?

Oh! such logic, Teddy. You may fool a few pin-headed weaklings with that old dope, but the most of them are next to your game, Teddy

Socialists contend that the CAUSE of "class struggles" must be removed, then all will be well.

But this would be Socialism. If, as will be the case under Socialism, the workers got all they produced, there
wouldn’t be anything to “class struggle” about. Then the workers would get all they produced and shirkers would get all they produced—nothing.

Mr. Roosevelt, if “the interests of capital and labor are identical, why do the workers form unions and exclude the capitalists? Why do the capitalists form associations of their own and exclude the wage-earners? Why do the workers resort to the boycott and strike, and the capitalists resort to blacklist and lockout, if their interests are identical?

Why do the capitalists employ large lobbies to have legislatures pass certain laws—if not for their own benefit? Why do the capitalists use the courts to interpret the laws as they want them interpreted? And why do they use the judges to hurl injunctions against labor organizations, restraining them from picketing, from paying strike benefits, from publishing the names of “unfair firms,” from doing away with the things that lead to victory? Why do the capitalists use the militia and the police to crush the strikers and drive them back to work? And you, Mr. Roosevelt, reply: “Because their interests are identical.” Oh, you! (“the short and ugly word),” go back again to Africa and slay some more of your ancestors—the monkeys.

All enlightened people are laughing you to scorn, Mr. Roosevelt. Such noted political economists as Albion W. Small of Chicago University and Lester F. Ward of the Smithsonian Institute openly ridicule you for your ignorance and failure to recognize the universally accepted doctrine of “the class struggle.”

You, Mr. Roosevelt, know full well on which side your bread is buttered. The one dollar per word which that rank Standard Oil magazine, The Outlook, is paying you reveals your “class consciousness.”

Just because you, Mr. Roosevelt, are “class conscious” you pour out your vial of abuse upon the “class consciousness” of the workers.

You know full well, Mr. Roosevelt, that as soon as the great mass of the laborers come to realize these facts and act as a body along political lines, the employing class, whom you represent, is sure to go down to defeat. Because “class consciousness” is but another name for intelligence, and because intelligence on the part of the workers is injurious to capitalistic interests. Therefore you, the class-conscious Roosevelt, call it an evil thing.

But the Socialists, Mr. Roosevelt, do recognize that the only way to remove the classes and the class hatred is to
abolish the system by which one class lives and rules and
riots in luxury upon the product of another class. They
point out that only when the workers shall have been vic-
torious in this "class struggle" and shall have used that
victory to make workers and owners the same by making
the workers the collective owners of the earth and the
things with which they work will, all classes, class struggles
and class hatred disappear.

Mr. Roosevelt, you cannot remove the fact of "classes"
by simple denial. Get in the game, Roosevelt, and help de-
molish the SYSTEM which breeds them.

"Class consciousness" among the workers today is the
most tremendous force for intelligent progress that has
ever jarred this old world in its course. It is the force that,
stretching across boundary lines, is making wars impossi-
ble. It is the force that is making millions upon millions
of men and women, every dividing force of race and blood
and distance, join together in a common movement for
human freedom. It is a force that grows with every turn
of the earth upon its axis, and that will never cease to grow
until child slavery and sweatshops and exploitation of man
by man shall be no more.

This, Mr. Roosevelt, is "class consciousness," and all
your hysterical abuse will serve but to arouse it in millions
more."

Socialists ignore the fact that God created the people
unequal and therefore, as a result of this unequal creation,
the various classes of society are here. Such "froth" as the
above will not obliterate that great fact. Roosevelt is deal-
ing with these classes practically and not theoretically.

THE GROWTH OF SOCIALISM.

THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IS THE GREATEST
POLITICAL MOVEMENT IN ALL HISTORY. FOUR-
TEEN MILLION MEN VOTE THE SOCIALIST TICKET
THROUGHOUT THE CIVILIZED WORLD.

ELEVEN HUNDRED AND FORTY SOCIALISTS SIT
IN THE PARLIAMENTS OF THE WORLD. TWELVE
THOUSAND SOCIALISTS SIT IN THE CITY COUNCILS
AND MINOR ASSEMBLIES.

THE SOCIALIST VOTE ALMOST DOUBLED ITSELF
OVER TWO YEARS AGO AND CAPITALISM NOW
SLEEPS WITH A NIGHTMARE EVERY NIGHT.

 ALWAYS AND EVERYWHERE THE SOCIALISTS
IN OFFICE HAVE STRIVEN TO UPLIFT THE HUMAN
RACE.
CHILD LABOR.

No fledgling feeds the father-bird,
No chicken feeds the hen;
No kitten mouses for the cat—
This glory is for men.

We are the Wisest, Strongest Race!
Loud may our praise be sung!
The only animal alive
That lives upon its young.

—Charlotte Perkins Gilman.
THE "BIG STICK."

Roosevelt's plan of ruling firmly with the "Big Stick" is feebly attacked as follows:

That the advocacy of the "Big Stick," government by punishment, as the remedy against the evil society suffers from, is the most arrant nonsense, needs but a moment's reflection to see.

The "Big Stick!" What is it, anyhow?
It is composed of civil law, policemen, constables, sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys and courts, little and big, and prisons—a mighty expensive affair.

When is the "Big Stick" to be used?
Never before, always after the crime is committed and the evil met. To illustrate: Take crooks in trusts. They have robbed you by high prices for years. Will the "Big Stick" restore your losses? What you have lost is gone. To apply the "Big Stick" you go down in your pockets, "dig up," pay all costs and get what?—what Paddy shot at—"nothin'"—an intelligent procedure, don't you think?

But suppose you "win out" and land the thief in the pen, the very acme of success; then what? Go down in your trousers for the cost of his grub and feed him.

What is the whole scheme of government by punishment more than locking the stable with a mighty expensive lock after the horse is stolen? Notwithstanding its advocacy by the church and Teddy, where is there a more silly proposition than the "Big Stick?"

Be fools no longer! Disarm the crook. Strip him of the only tool by which he can plunder, the SPECIAL PRIVILEGE. Own the trusts yourselves.—Dr. C. H. Reed.

ROOSEVELT VS. LORD RUSSELL.

Socialists have endeavored to create a wrong impression by quoting from the recent speech of Hon. Charles Russell, noted Catholic leader and son of Lord Russell.

Here is the speech of the noted Catholic leader:

The first thing we have to consider is the question, what is the origin of the present Socialist movement? It is to be found in the present deplorable and appalling state of society. We have, on the one hand, prodigious growth of wealth in a few hands; nearly three-fourths of the land of England is held by ten thousand people, while twelve thousand men own two-thirds of our industries. Accompanying this we have amongst the rich an unparalleled growth of luxury and extravagance; on the other side we have a tremendous growth of poverty and destitution, a want of work,
an increase in sweating and misery amongst the poor.

The race is deteriorating, and we have to admit that out of a population of 45,000,000, 12,000,000 are on the verge of starvation. We have the greater part of the owners of great wealth doing nothing to remedy the evil conditions of the poor. As Cardinal Gibbons has said, "No friend of his race can contemplate without painful emotions the heartless monopolists and grasping avarice which has dried up every sentiment of sympathy, and sordid selfishness which is deaf to cries of distress. Their whole aim is to realize large dividends without regard to the claims of justice and charity. These trusts and monopolies, like the Car of Jugernaut, crush every obstacle that stands in their way; they compel their operatives to work for starvation wages, especially in mining districts and factories, where protests are but a feeble effort and are easily stifled by intimidation."

That is the state of affairs which has brought about the rapid growth of Socialistic views, and is it to be wondered at that thoughtful men should seek a new remedy and should have come to the conclusion that the present condition of affairs must be ended and cannot be mended? Of course, if all the world were to live up to the teachings of the Master things would not be as they exist, but the human race being what it is, a remedy remains to be found. I do not for a moment suggest Socialism as the remedy, but this is true, I think, that except upon lines of Socialism there is at the present moment no other remedy proposed. The burden is upon anybody who denounces Socialism to suggest an alternative, but up to the present moment Socialism alone holds the field.

Now, Socialism is denounced by many of our Catholic priests and Catholic laymen as something abominable which no Catholic can support or tolerate, and Socialists are declared to be fools or knaves; and that is the attitude which I wish you to examine today. Again, I repeat, I am not a Socialist, but I want to ask you whether this attitude towards Socialism is either just or wise?

Its definition is well known and admitted: It is the municipalization of the sources of production and distribution, or, in other words, it is a system under which the state is to own all the productive business and manufactories in a country instead of their being owned, as at present, by a fortunate and favored section of the community.

Now, in the first place, a moment's reflection will at once reveal this: that Socialism is not a thing which can be brought about by either violence or revolution. Being
a state of affairs which means a complete change in the
habits and thoughts of mankind, it can only be achieved by
a slow, gradual change. It must be accomplished by evolu-
tion, not revolution.

In the next place, may I point out that at first sight,
and indeed I may say at second sight, there is nothing on
the face of that proposition which is contrary to Christian-
ity or Catholicism. Indeed, in this and other Christian
countries we have gone a good way along the road which
leads to the ultimate realization of that condition. The
state in different instances owns telephones, water supply,
tramways, gas supply, telegraphs, the postal service and
the tobacco industry, and I confess I have not noticed any
material change for better or worse taking place in the re-
ligion or morals of the tramway officials or passengers, or
of the telephone operators, since those systems have been
transferred to the state.

In what, then, can it be said that Socialism is un-Chris-
tian and un-Catholic? One way in which this is endeavored
to be established is the assertion that it means the expro-
priation without compensation by the state of private prop-
erties of individuals, but this is not necessarily so, and the
leading Socialist parties in this country do not advocate for
a moment any such proceeding. They are, in fact, strongly
opposed to it. We have already arrived at the municipaliza-
tion of industries representing tens of thousands of mil-
lions of money without adopting such a course.

But even supposing that Socialism did mean the expro-
priation without compensation (which it does not), I am
tempted to ask, is it therefore either anti-Christian or anti-
Catholic? It is admitted that the state has a right to tax
property of the subject, but does not a right to tax involve
necessarily a right to take if it should be for the public
good that the property should be taken?

It is perfectly moral and right to take a twentieth part
of a man’s property, as is done by income tax at present, or
a tenth part, as is done often by death duties, or a fourth
part, as is done by increment tax. But if it be admitted that
it is right and proper to take a twentieth, a tenth, a fourth
for the good of the state, why is it un-Christian and im-
oral, if the state needs it, to take the whole? Where does
virtue cease and vice begin? I submit that it must logically
follow that the right to tax must necessarily involve the
right to take. Test the matter in another way. Does any-
body deny the right of a state to insist upon its subjects be-
coming soldiers and giving up their lives for the good of
the state? If the state can take a man's life when it is for the good of the nation to do so, surely it has also the right to take his property for the same object.

Again, I wish to repeat I am not a Socialist. I strongly object and protest against Socialism being fought upon wrong lines and, to my mind, it is fighting it on wrong lines to denounce it on the ground of religion and morality. It is not only unfair fighting, but, like the rest of unfair fighting, it is a very foolish procedure, because if all the forces of religion are turned against Socialism it will inevitably follow in course of time that all the forces of Socialism will necessarily be turned against religion, whereas if Socialism is met, as it ought to be met, and fought on the battleground of economic principles, we will then be meeting it and fighting it on a fair field with no favor. Of course, I am quite aware of the argument which will be mentioned against me: that I should have referred to the writings and speeches of individual Socialists who denounce religion and discourse upon a grotesque morality of their own. Those are the views of individual Socialists. Those views are to be deplored and denounced, but they are the views of individual Socialists. It is a mere confusion of the very serious and grave issues at stake to rely upon them in a discussion like this. It would be as logical to denounce the medical profession because many of them abuse their knowledge, or artists and poets because so many stoop to use their talents to pander to vice. It would be as reasonable to denounce Liberalism, the Liberal party, because John Morley is an avowed agnostic, or Toryism because Mr. Balfour to a large extent shares the same views. The enemies of religion and the enemies of morality are to be found in all ranks and in all parties. It is a curious thing today that the most violent anti-church politician in France is also one of the most violent anti-Socialistic leaders; I refer to M. Clemenceau.

Now, as I have said, let us meet Socialism and fight it with the proper weapons. Let us point out the evils of Socialism, the impracticability of Socialism; that it must necessarily destroy all incentive to effort and invention. These and kindred arguments, which it is not our business to go into tonight, are those which are to be employed to battle Socialism, but I protest most strongly against the fulmination of religious thunderbolts, even when they are delivered by our genial friend, Father Bernard Vaughan, from a select platform in the Queen's hall, a duke in the chair, and Rothschild's band discoursing sweet music!
Persuasion sometimes makes converts—denunciations never. Nothing you can say or do will prevent the mass of the nation listening to the teachings of Socialism. The people know and feel the moral disease from which they are suffering, and they will listen to all serious people who propose a remedy. They will listen, too, to you if you are prepared to show the falseness of the remedy; but mere wholesale abuse and denunciation will merely make them turn away in disgust and drive them in the very direction from which you wish to divert them.

Socialists still stick to their foolish theory that it is capitalism that has caused all the wealth of all nations to drift into the hands of a few, England included.

Observe that while Lord Russell acknowledges that conditions are terrible in England, he denies that Socialism is the remedy. Yet the Socialists have the monumental gall to quote him.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

President Roosevelt says: "There are bound to be idle mills and factories, and idle workers whenever there's a general over-production such as we've been having during the past few years."

To this simple and self-evident truth the Socialists have nothing better than the following to offer. Is it not unworthy even of a kindergarten pupil?

Think what Roosevelt's statement means. It means that countless thousands of people must freeze, suffer and starve because they have produced too much food, shelter and clothing. Who would not prefer to be a savage rather than a modern civilized jobless man, starving in the midst of plenty? Is it possible to have "over-production of clothes with millions of men, women and children shivering for lack of comfortable clothing? Can there be an "over-production" of farm products with millions living on a scanty diet of coarse food?

Is it possible that our country is lacking the natural resources? Is it possible that our factories are inadequate to meet the actual needs of the people?

From earliest childhood I have been taught by teacher and preacher in both prose and poetry, that this is the greatest, richest, grandest and finest nation on earth; that from its hills and valleys, its never-ending fields and forests, its rivers and lakes, the people have a store of wealth more than enough for all. It is indeed true that our mountains of iron ore, our vast coal fields, veritable lakes of oil
and infinite variety of minerals and natural resources are sufficient to supply the world. Our vast tracts of fertile soil are the envy of nations. Government experts declare that the State of Texas alone is capable of sustaining the population of the nation, while our irrigated lands, if properly developed, could easily support millions more.

This country is thickly dotted with factories, each filled with modern machinery capable of converting this raw material into useful commodities in overwhelming abundance. Yet millions of men, able and willing to work, are forced to remain idle while their families freeze and starve. So terrible is the suffering and so general the poverty that eighty-two per cent of the people do not own a home.

The Bowery Commission of New York in a recent report says there are four million five hundred thousand persons now out of employment in these United States. This is certainly “going some” for the most civilized, enlightened and intelligent nation on earth. Inferior nations must surely be having a hard time of it.

All these people are out of a job because there is no work for them to do. This means, of course, everybody has all he wants. All needs are fully supplied.

Mr. Thomas A. Edison says that with his latest invention, the wonderful cast-iron moulds with which a house can be poured of solid cement, thirty men working together can build a house in one and one-half days, and that they can keep up this average the entire year, completing two hundred houses in that time. These houses are modern, with bathroom, laundry tubs, water, etc., and would cost from $4,000 to $5,000, if built of brick or stone. They are made wholly of cement and sand.

United States government reports show that two-thirds of the families in this enlightened land have no homes.

There are 18,000,000 families in this country. Twelve million of them have no homes. These twelve million families want homes. Four and one-half million people have no jobs. These people want jobs.

There is plenty of material to make into cement, and plenty of men to make it. There are hills and deserts of sand, besides mountains of cement.

Why, then, don’t our keen statesmen and big-brainy business men get their heads together and start these four and one-half million of idle people who want jobs to work at building houses for these twelve million families who want homes?
Four and one-half million people would make 121,000 groups of workers, each of which could build two hundred houses in one year. This four and one-half million people could therefore build a modern eight-room palace for every homeless family (twelve millions of them) in six months’ time. Why don’t they do it?

One man suggests that this is because these people would not build houses without money for the work. This is a mistake. These people do not want money. If they got money for their work they would get rid of it as quickly as they could. They would trade the money off for food, clothing and shelter.

These twelve million families are just as anxious to produce food and clothing for those other people as those other people are to build homes for those who need them.

Why, then, do those people not do as they wish? Simply because a few people who do not want to build houses now or produce clothing and food, own all the means of doing this work and will not allow these people to produce what they want.

Socialism proposes to give all the opportunity to supply their needs in the following manner: Under Socialism the gifts of God or nature’s God—the mills, factories and the land—will be restored to the people—all the people. Then these hoards of unemployed, homeless and starving people can take the raw material, feed it into the factories and produce what they want. If they should produce too much they could have a picnic instead of a panic. Under these conditions, if any man suffered it would be his own fault. Today millions suffer because a few own the means of life.

Moral: “If any man will not work, neither shall he eat.” No man should be allowed to own what he does not use. Those who produce wealth should have wealth. Those who produce nothing should have what they produce—nothing.

**THE DOLLAR AND THE CROSS.**

The News-Bee of Toledo, Ohio, recently published the following tirade on the noble effort of our millionaires to spread Christianity. It is in keeping with the miserable slur on the “boy scout movement” and a left-handed slap at Roosevelt.

It is a bold statement, when we consider that the News-Bee is one of the scores of newspapers owned by the Scripps McRae league, reaching as it does from ocean to ocean:

“We are going to have a big national religious revival
led by men whose combined wealth runs into hundreds of millions. J. P. Morgan and Labor-Crusher Post are at the head of it. The movement will be 'organized by business men on business lines' and is to beat anything 'in the history of the human race since the days of the Reformation.' Which is really going some!

"Now, why this sudden access of spirituality on the part of Organized Dollars? Why have the multi-millioned leaders of American business got religion at this particular juncture? Why are they so determined to ram it down the throats of all the rest of us?

"In his work on 'Social Evolution,' Benjamin Kidd thus defines religion:

"'A religion is a form of belief, providing an ultra-rational sanction for that large class of conduct in the individual where his interests and the interests of the social organism are antagonistic, and by which the former are rendered subordinate to the latter in the general interests of the evolution which the race is undergoing.'

"That, perhaps, is a little abstruse—hard to get hold of and digest—though it states a great historical and philosophical truth. Try it this way:

"You are having a devil of a time in this world trying to get enough to eat. If the country goes to war, you do the fighting and leave your wives and babies to struggle alone. In the piping days of peace, you live, perhaps in a tenement and work in a sweatshop. But it's all right.

"From the blood-stained field, the squalid tenement, the stifling sweatshop and factory, you look upward comforted by the conviction that beyond your earthly horizon lie peace, happiness and eternal reward for those who bear their present burdens with meekness and fortitude—and are dead.

"Do you get it? Your fathers and grandfathers got it, all right. And you are going to get it if the 'biggest revival in human history, can pound it into your thick old head.

"Big Business and Religion! Coming, a monopoly of the right to kneel at the foot of the cross!"

ANTI-RELIGION.

Roosevelt hands the Socialists a stunner in the following:

"The doctrinaire Socialists, the extremists, the men who represent the doctrine in its most advanced form, are, and must necessarily be, not only convinced opponents of private property, but also bitterly hostile to religion and morality."
I will let Marx, the Socialist God, make reply to the private property charge:

"You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society, private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for a few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

"In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

Evidently the Socialists intend to make the world and all that therein is the property of all the people of the world.

That Socialists are "bitterly hostile to religion and morality" is denied by them as follows:

"We know that all religions have been produced under the flush of economic causes, but that it is worse than foolish to attack any religion so long as the economic cause for its survival exist. Economic evolution has made much of what is called morality most profoundly immoral, and Socialism, the greatest moral force in the world today, is the bitter foe of immorality, especially when wearing the mask of morality.'

The following proves the old adage that the biggest fool is the educated fool. Is it any wonder that college professors fail to hold public confidence? Will some other college confer another "degree" on this learned mortal and then away with him to the asylum?

"The charge that Socialists are opposed to religion is admitted or denied conditionally. If religion be defined as the sum total of all sentiments in favor of private ownership of the means of production and distribution, then Socialists are opposed to religion. But if religion is defined as the sum total of all sentiments in favor of a future life, and religionists confine their activities to propagating said sentiments, then Socialists have nothing hostile to say. Practically, however, religionists are here on earth, with a very definite earthly policy—the pretense that this earthly policy is to fit us for future wings is fine pretense—Socialists are opposed to a part of the policy. All Socialists, without a single exception heard from, are opposed to that part of religious policy or national morality which sanctions and safeguards private ownership of the means of produc-
tion and distribution. Political Socialism has a definite constitution: it proposes to substitute public ownership for private ownership in a prescribed field, and any one who attempts to represent Socialism as something else belongs to the Ananias Club."—O. E. Latham, M. A., Ph.B., M. D., Ann Arbor.

THE REV. PARKHURST.

Realizing that Rev. Parkhurst, a clergyman of international prominence is a friend of Roosevelt, the Socialists misrepresent him by taking a few sentences from the context to prove that Socialism is not hostile to the church. Deception is the principal stock in trade of Socialists. They quote him under the caption,

"A FAIR STATEMENT."

Charles H. Parkhurst, in speaking of the expulsion of Alexander T. Irvine from a New York pastorate for his advocacy of Socialism, said, very sensibly:

"There is properly no quarrel between the church and Socialism.

"The church has to do with religious truth and doctrine; Socialism has to do with economic truth and doctrine. The provinces covered by the two respectively are not coincident.

"The best of churchmen may be a Socialist, and may not be. The best of Socialists may be churchmen, and may not be.

"The church has a definite purpose to subserve, and it is no legitimate part of that purpose to determine methods of governmental administration."

If more people understood these distinctions there would be less nonsense about "Socialism being opposed to religion," fewer organizations of good meaning people for the purpose of fighting the greatest moral awakening of modern times. There is no antagonism between Socialism and anything that is really good and doing a work for humanity. Some day they who are fighting the movement for economic freedom and justice are going to discover that they have made fools of themselves and have misled the people.

ANTI-RELIGION.

More of the Socialist misrepresentation follows when they quote from "The Living Church," a Milwaukee Episcopal periodical:

"What has drawn the church and the Socialists together is the recognition that in the ideals of each is much
in common. * * * Both classes have found it possible to work together for the general uplift of the city without a ripple or discord.

"It is a pleasure to add that the first three months of the new Socialist administration have done more to promote high standards in public office and efficiency in civic ideals for the protection and uplifting of all the people than its most ardent supporters had deemed possible in advance.

"Milwaukee is, today, an object lesson in municipal efficiency, in so far as obsolete and oftentimes vexatious laws will allow. It is not difficult to prophesy a continuance of the alliance between various forces for civic ideals, in which churchmen constitute no inconsiderable factor."

The following attempt to harmonize Christianity and Socialism is laughable to say the least:

CHRISTIANITY.

The people are everlastingly reminded by the press, by orators, and from the pulpit and by Roosevelt, to beware of Socialism, as it will "bust up" the home and destroy religion. This, however, is not in accord with the best authorities in the English language. The Encyclopedia Britannica says that "The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity," neither does it agree with Webster's dictionary: "Socialism is a theory of society that advocates a more precise, orderly and harmonious arrangement of the social relations of mankind than that which has hitherto prevailed." Does that appear to you as likely to destroy Christianity?

Paul says, "If any man among you will not work, neither shall he eat." Socialism is in harmony with this doctrine because it gives every man an equal opportunity to create wealth, and further, it guarantees him the full social equivalent of his labor. To-day the workers get only one-eighth. Socialism would give him eight-eighths or all he creates. In what way would this knock out Christianity? Anyone who says that Socialism interferes in any way with religion does so either because he doesn't know its meaning or because he is financially benefited by misrepresenting it. In the first case he exhibits himself as an ignoramus, and in the second he is a genuine hypocrite and therefore entirely unfit to discuss Socialism.

Socialism proposes a solution for economic ills—not religious ills. It is primarily a bread and butter proposition. How to feed, clothe and shelter humanity is its chief aim. It does not concern itself about your belief or disbelief in a
God or the future state of man. It has no more to do with
religion than it has with astronomy or biology.

It is not the fault of Socialism that a few infidels or
atheists vote that ticket. The Republican party should not
be censured because Ambassador White wrote "Conflict of
Science and Religion." Even good old Abe Lincoln was an
avowed spiritualist. Our dear little Willie Taft does not
believe in the "divinity" of Jesus Christ. Bob Ingersoll was
a shining light in the Republican camp and yet he was an
arch-enemy of the Bible. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of
the Democratic party, was an infidel, and yet the rank and
file of that party revere his memory. There are a hundred
infidels in the old parties to where there is one in the So-
cialist party. Is it not just as reasonable for you to say
that these infidel Democrats and Republicans would destroy
religion as it is for you to say that a few atheists in the
Socialist party will destroy religion? Has not every one
a perfect right to his religious beliefs? Would you stop to
ascertain the religion of an artist before admiring his pic-
ture, of a musician before hearing him perform, or a physi-
cian before taking his prescription? Then why not investi-
gate Socialism on its own merits. Why not study Socialism
for yourself and learn its grand truths from those who have
devoted their life to the subject and not accept the mouth-
ings of an ignoramus or the false statements of some oily-
tongued tool of Plutocracy?

If Socialism is false and pernicious, if it is an "evil
thing," as all these vilifiers claim it is, why don't they turn
to the Socialist platform (page . . .), take up plank after
plank and answer us with their logic, instead of resorting to
misrepresentation and falsification? If I wished to under-
stand the Bible you would expect me to read and study it
diligently and not attribute to the Bible something it does
not contain and upon that false statement base my argu-
ment "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," pre-
supposes that I have read the Bible, and when a minister of
the gospel denounces Socialism it is supposed that he has
read Socialism, and yet, in nine cases out of ten; he has read
not even so much as a five-cent pamphlet.

"Recently two consecrated ministers were talking with me
about Socialism. One was the pastor of a large Methodist
church, the other a noted Evangelist. They admitted the truth of
the terrible arraignment of present social conditions as uttered
by Socialists—millions of child slaves coining their little
bodies, brains and souls into bloody dollars to make rich men
richer; millions of women, with no hope of home joys, forced to
choose between slow starvation and shame because of their low
wages; more than ten millions of men, women and children in
America forced to abject want through lack of a chance to earn an honest living at fair wages; over thirty millions of our people in addition living from hand to mouth in the unceasing, exhausting, and soul-racking struggle for existence; many millions more living in comparative plenty, but forced daily into "the battle of life" where all is "fair" because love of family spurs to relentless activity, when the war of commercial interest crushes out manhood beneath the ruthless hoofs of greed and where even the "captains" hold their places by conscienceless intrigue against each other—a nation writhing in the misery of want, slavery, prostitution, theft, tyranny and murder.

"But," they said, "you cannot save society from these horrors until you have changed human nature. The Christian religion alone can do that. You must get the individuals converted to Christ then society will be saved."

"How long have you been at this task?" I asked.

Pausing a moment, with a new light suddenly breaking on his face, the pastor said: "Nearly 2,000 years."

"What part of the world's population nominally accepts Christ?" Said I.

"Less than one-third," he answered sadly.

"What proportion of the people nominally Christian belong to the church?" asked I again.

"Not more than half," he admitted with deepening gloom.

"What portion of church members are really consecrated to Christ and striving to advance His Kingdom?" was my last piercing question.

With tears in his eyes, he answered: "Not one in ten."

"What a disheartening record must the Christian face.

AFTER MORE THAN 1000 YEARS OF CHRISTIAN EFFORT NOT MORE THAN ONE PERSON IN SIXTY OF THE PRESENT GENERATION HAS BEEN TRULY CONVERTED TO CHRIST

BY THE METHOD OF INDIVIDUAL SALVATION. "At this rate" said I after we had summed up the estimate, how long will it take to save the world.

When this question reached their hearts, both ministers hung their heads and confessed that the prospect was utterly discouraging.—Rev. E. E. Carr in Christian Socialist.

It will be in order now to consider WHY Christianity has made such slow progress. Without going into detail it must be evident that so long as man must struggle long hours for a mere animal existence he never has and never will develop his better nature or have a desire to investigate spiritual realms. To a man in extreme sickness health is his only thought, but with health returned he thinks of other things. To attain a higher ideal we must eliminate the mere struggle for existence. Socialism, alone, points out the remedy.

Under capitalism it is impossible to practice the Golden Rule, and if any capitalist should attempt to pay his employees wages equal to his income, he would be forced into bankruptcy by his competitors. Therefore capitalism prevents people from living true Christian lives.

Only one man of prominence in this nation ever tried...
to practice the Golden Rule on a large scale and it was such a novel attempt that everyone remembers "Golden Rule Jones" of Toledo, Ohio. Strange as it may seem, every preacher and every church organization in Toledo was fighting him to a finish. Evidently the preachers didn't recognize the Golden Rule when they saw it.

He partially succeeded because he had a "patent"—which is virtually a monopoly. This enabled him to give five per cent of the net profits to his employes.

Under capitalism the "Golden Rule" has changed to a "gold rule." "Do others or they will do you." Some are not cute enough to "do" others even if they wished to, while many good people would rather be "done" than "do" others.

All noble characters are comparatively poor, as was Jesus. How can anyone be a Christian and be a millionaire in the midst of the cries of the poor and needy? How comes it that some ministers in large cities accept salaries ranging from five to twenty-five thousand dollars per year, keep a retinue of servants, own autos and live on the fat of the land while a few blocks away people actually commit suicide rather than endure their poverty and hunger? Would Jesus thus cavort about if on earth today? Is that the way to attract the poor to Christianity or will that drive them away?

While reading the following bear in mind that "All wealth is the result of mental and physical labor applied to the natural resources." The following is quoted from the sermon of the Rev. Dr. Frank J. Mundy of Chicago:

"Socialism is to be censured for teaching that property does not belong to those who HOLD it but to those who put their labor into it. Socialism is an institution whose teachings and work are worthy only of condemnation and passing away."

This well-paid imitation of a Christian is evidently preaching the kind of "stuff" demanded of him by millionaires occupying the amen corners in his church and living on profits of child labor. The rank and file of the church people, together with their pastors, are true Christians, and it is regrettable that they accept as gospel such statements as Rev. Mundy makes without further investigation.

So long as sermons of this kind are preached just so long will the church fail of its true mission, and just so long will it be necessary for such good souls as Rev. Father O'Brien to acknowledge that "Fifty years ago nearly every one belonged to some church, now less than one-third of the people of the United States are even professed Christians." Socialists are ever ready to work shoulder to shoulder with any portion of the people who are really try-
ing to uplift humanity. What we have to say about the church is only a reply to the savage attacks and many misrepresentations aimed at Socialists, and even a cur will defend himself under such conditions. Capitalists have not hesitated to use the church to prolong their reign. It is a travesty on Christianity when such preachers as Rev. Mundy enter into an unholy alliance with and act as the moral police force of tyrants. When they attempt to hypnotize poverty with promises of heaven, while the plutes are looting the world—when they preach contentment and submission and compel humanity to live wretched lives and fill shameful graves that the elect may live in affluence—when they preach heaven and help plutocracy to turn earth into a hell—when they see our sons march in endless procession to the prison and the scaffold—when they see our daughters take their places in the brothel while every fiber of their poor frames and brains shriek out in protest against insufficient nourishment, such ministers as Rev. Mundy stand by without a murmur. When hard pressed as to WHY they are silent they tell us “it is well for us to starve; that starvation is the especial gate to heaven.” It is then that Socialism comes forth in righteous wrath and denounces—not Christianity, but brazen hypocrisy.

Socialists do not underestimate the purified individual soul. These are swept and garnished habitations in which the angels dwell and look with unpolluted eyes upon the world. But this is not ALL that is needed. To merely make a few virtuous where the many are vicious, is to place goodness at a disadvantage.

While the church labors to save one soul, poverty crushes a million into sin. The church is plucking brands from a constantly increasing conflagration. The flames continue to advance and devour what you have saved. The religion of the world must be built on the rock of universal prosperity, and justice is that rock. Justice is now lacking. Men permanently love only those things that are beneficial to them. Hence the grip of the churches on humanity has been steadily lessening during the past hundred years. The churches must come to the rescue of the people or retire from the field. The church is beginning to see the logic of industrial and social liberty and when she acts as though she meant to help instead of hinder Socialism, the Kingdom will be close at hand. Countless thousands of Christians have espoused Socialism and hundreds of ministers of all denominations have joined the Socialist party and are
preaching true Socialism from their pulpits regularly.
"Christian Socialists Fellowships" are being organized
among church people everywhere.

THE BOY SCOUT MOVEMENT.
(By George R. Kirkpatrick, Author of War—What For?)

The "Boy Scout" movement has the endorsement of all
leading men as well as the churches of all denominations.
Patriotism is its chief corner stone. If the capitalists wish
to use the "boy scouts" in time of war, that is their busi-
ness. War, wholesale murder, always was and always will
be justifiable. The ignorant mob—those who produce all
wealth—never have and never will rule. In spite of this
self-evident fact a prominent Socialist publishes a book filled
from cover to cover with highly treasonable matter. A short
quotation will suffice to show that it should be suppressed:

The Boy Scout movement is an organized, craftily sub-
sidized effort for creating the kill-lust in boys, the love of
arms, the desire for military life, and the brainlessly au-
tomatic obedience of soldiers. As many boys as possible
are to be blinded with steel-glitter, deafened with drum-
roar, dazzled with uniforms and flattery, fooled with drills
and marches, seduced with ribbons, sashes, "Teddy" hats,
to have a host of trained, armed guards ready for use in the
woods—betrayed into stupid gratitude to the crafty, dol-
lar-marked subsidizers of the movement, who plan thus
to have a host of trained armed guards ready for use in the
swiftly coming future when millions have their wages cut
and millions more are forced into the street to the ranks
of the unemployed army.

The pretense—of course there is some fine pretense—is that "the boys are to be physically developed." That is
the sly cry of the promoters—"the ennobling physical de-
v elopment of the youth."

While the boys are to be physically developed they are
to have their intellects ossified and their sociability suf-
focated.

The boys are to have their wills killed by a thousand
drills in a slave's crowning virtue—obedience.

Obedience—word of infinite import in the history of
organized robbery of the workers by the shirkers.

Obedience, automatic obedience, has been and is now
the damnation of the workers.

Because the slave begins to think and more and more
refuses the role of professional cutthroat. The Department
of Murder is shriveling in popularity. The fist of blood and
iron is decreasingly dependable. The right hand of national and international working class fellowship and working class loyalty begins to charm the toilers of the world. The eyes of the socially damned multitude begin to blaze with intelligent and fascinated realization of the fact that war means suicide for the working class, that hell’s sleet of lead and steel from Gatling guns is for the working class, that the jaws of death spread wide for the working class—and only for the working class—in any and all wars.

The slave thinks. Caesar is startled.

Therefore catch the slave’s son and kill the kindness of his soul, destroy his sociability, resurrect the savage in his heart, rouse the beast that slumbers in his breast, fire his passions, befog his intellect and kill his will.

Let Mars seduce the boy.

Let the blood-stained god of war blast the boy’s fraternalism and plant in his soul the cheap aspirations of a proud-strutting, gilt-braided butcher—affire with a desire for bloody deeds.

Sting dead the bud of love in the small boy—the helpless small boy.

A human fool-tool is needed in the shop, mill and mine. Therefore, step forth, you cheap prostitutes of the various intellectual professions, all of you who bow the knee to the steel and gold gods of industry, and shout aloud the incomparable excellences, advantages, superiorities and desirabilities of the Boy Scout enterprise. Take the boys to the woods and train them, take them to the street and train them, take them to the armory and train them—and also and especially take them to the basement of the churches and train them, mockingly train them there to “love their fellowmen” and carefully prepare them to butcher their fellow men. In substance, teach each helpless boy to think and say and agree to this:

“Obedience is beautiful. Blind obedience to superiors in perfection. I am inferior. I agree that those who are appointed over me ought to be over me. I will make no inquiries.

“I will obey anybody who is said to be (or who may be appointed by somebody to be) my superior. I will obey any and all orders from my superiors—WITHOUT QUESTION. I will obey my employer and be loyal to him. I will obey my captain, because (no matter how cheap, vulgar, ignorant, cruel and vicious he may be) he is my superior.

“I will always believe that well-dressed people know more than I know, and more than I should be permitted to
know. I will always let others inform me what my duty is. I will forget that I have a brain (if I have one). I will gladly learn to handle the sword, rifle and bayonet—for I may be needed, my superiors tell me.

"I will gladly learn the glory of arms, the splendor of war, the grandeur of red-stained patriotism, and the nobility of narrow-brained, low-browed race prejudice and cheap jealousy. I accept my employer as my best friend, as my ideal and my idol. I will make a faithful effort to become a fool—or a loyal endeavor to remain one—for my employer's sake.

"Proudly I accept the high honor of being an automatic jackass, ready for the dull role of armed guard for the coward ruling class. And all I ask is flattery and a "good time" sometimes—if it suits my employer."

At the age of three the tiny boys of all races and colors gleefully romp and play together; sociability has its own glad way with them in happy laughter, sweet caresses, and a thousand gracious amiabilities promising the poetry and fraternalism and the ever more glorious levels of life for the human family.

But at the age of twenty these same children, shrewdly poisoned with geographic and ethic "patriotism," cursed by the embrace of Mars, damned by the false teachings of prideless intellectual prostitutes, are proudly ready to slaughter one another at the nod of syphilitic kings, cheap queens, at the order of coarse-grained presidents, pot-house statesmen and small-brained commanders.

A boy scout is an incipient assassin, a budding jingo, a germinating butcher of men—a boy, innocent and excellent fruit of love, being transformed into a blood-lusting fool and tool to serve in the great class struggle as an iron fist for the employer class against the working class.

All the "best" people are encouraging the movement—from President Taft to the pettiest political and sacerdotal snivelings, willing to sell their souls for bread and popularity with the kings of industry. The boy scout movement is a recent handsome wrinkle on the snout of the beast of capitalism.

GOVERNMENT OWNED TELEGRAPHS.

Ex-President Roosevelt believes that the Goulds and Rockefellers should own the telegraphs for the reason that graft would run riot if turned over to the people. That the great trusts can operate them better than the republi-
can and democratic politicians is believed by all save the Socialists.

Here is the Socialist bombast:

**England’s Telegraphs.**

"Great Britain had private ownership of the telegraphs for about seventeen years, and finding the people so poorly served decided to purchase the lines and have postal telegraph. Note the result Mr. Roosevelt: In a few years the number of stations where messages could be sent had increased over ten times, the cost of messages was reduced one-half, and the employees wages were increased one-third; today "messages that cost 25 cents in England in 1870, can be sent for six cents; while the messages that cost 25 cents in the United States in 1870, now cost 30 cents." Observe Mr. Roosevelt that this is from Consular Reports. Private companies work for dividends and not for the people. Every country in England and North and South America has government ownership of the telegraphs except the United States, Yucatan and Honduras.

**Wanamaker’s Effort for Private Telegraph.**

Hon. John Wanamaker, the merchant prince, when postmaster general under President Ben Harrison, became so impressed with the value of the postal telegraph for the people that he labored hard for nearly four years, but unsuccessfully, trying to have congress pass a law establishing the system in this country. The telegraph companies who control the associated press and through them most, if not all the great dailies of the country distorted and combated his facts so that little correct information was given the public.

"Less than one per cent of our people use the telegraph to transmit messages, while 55 per cent of the population of Switzerland and 61 per cent of the population of Belgium use the telegraph."

The late professor Frank Parsons of Boston, the well known author, after a careful study of the telegraph systems of Europe and America, came to the conclusion that our government for $50,000,000 could build the lines and reach every post office in the country so that telegraph messages of thirty words could be sent for five cents per message, regardless of distance; that we could use a five-cent telegraph stamp and that the government would make money on such a system. Ex-congressman J. J. Lentz made the same statement in the halls of congress and it was not
disputed. It was also proven that the railroad companies charge Uncle Sam EIGHT times as much per pound, for hauling the mail as they do the express companies for hauling express packages.

That is why the Wells Fargo Express Company declared a 300 per cent dividend on watered stock last year and the other Express Companies did about as well.

Socialists declare that Uncle Sam should own the telegraphs, express companies, railroads, factories, etc., but you Mr. Roosevelt while pretending to be a friend of labor are helping the plutocrats to rob the people by opposing "the government ownership of the means of production and distribution."

Oh, Teddy, you gay deceiver. The people will get next to your curves one of these fine days and then it will be to the tall timber for a once famous (?) hunter.

PRIVATE PROPERTY.

"Not so much as the first step towards real civilization can be taken until there arises some development of the right of private property."—Theodore Roosevelt.

Even the "big guns" of the Socialist party side-step this great truth by referring to the dim pre-historic ages. Their dream of the future is bolstered by their nightmare of the past as follows:

'The human race has been in existence for over one hundred thousand years, according to Louis Morgan. For ninety-five thousand years of that period it lead a communistic or tribal life. (Under communism all property is held in common).

These primitive men, pitted against the savage beast of prey, depending for their lives upon sheer physical force, the only determining factor whether the wild brute was to be dinner for the man or vice versa, were naturally forced to roam in bands, with the result that until five or six thousand years ago the social order of mankind was that of pure communism, the group or clan owning and enjoying land, rude tools, and tamed animals, in common. Thus we see that for 95,000 years the right of private ownership did not exist.

During all this period common property was deemed the only way of safeguarding to all the right of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. In fact nothing but common property could have enabled primitive society to survive. When, therefore, Roosevelt ignores the facts of history, admitted by all leading historians and scientists, he puts himself in the kindergarten class of politicians.
As a matter of fact there have been three great periods in the growth and development of the human race, viz: savagery, barbarism and civilization. All historians agree that there were three distinctly marked stages in savagery, one succeeding another; also three in barbarism, and that we are now in the second stage of civilization. There is yet a third. We stand in the day of its dawning. We are the heirs of all the countless ages of the past. We are the builders of the future.

As man passing in sequence through primitive life, savagery, barbarism and into civilization he became a hero worshiper, complimenting heroes with phrases, wreaths, titles, and finally with ownership of matter necessary to tribal life. As the habit of ownership grew, heroes began to struggle to own matter rather than to slay dragons; for he who owned matter had the symbol of heroism. In time, ownership separated the tribe into owners and dependents. Soon workers were reduced to the status of slaves similar to our southern slaves. The next development resulted in feudalism under which the laborers belong to the soil and the soil belonged to the lord. Feudalism soon developed into our present mode of conducting business, known as capitalism, where the tools of production and distribution are owned by a few and the workers receive a wage. The above are distinct epochs in the development of the human race and indicate the changes which were brought about by economic necessity and always by the successful struggle of the lower class against the upper owning class. No new system was ever established; however, until the old one had outlived its usefulness. Space forbids more than a mere mention of these class struggles.

Mr. Roosevelt, you should know that for countless thousands of years united effort, co-operation with common ownership of property was the system under which the human race advanced. You alone of all men deny this well established fact.

In the infancy of our race our ancestors fed themselves with roots and fruits and nuts gathered from the wilds which no man called his own. From a meaningless babble of unformed words, aided by gesture and grimace, in associated effort they produced a language, by associated effort they fought off the beasts of prey; and, standing together, they preserved the race of man from utter annihilation. To nuts and fruits they added fish, and built and kept a common fire, from which each could carry living coals, and no one said "This fire is mine." They contrived to use the bow
and arrow, and no one claimed the returns from another's toil. Woman's ingenuity and skill and toil made and used pottery and the simple tools of garden and field, but no woman said, "This field is mine!"

ALL COMMON PROPERTY, MR. ROOSEVELT.

In the early youth of this race of ours, primeval man, with no tusks in his mouth, no claws on his hands, hoofs on his heels, no horns on his head, and no wings on his back, acting by tribes, tamed and made helpers and companions of the individualistic tusks and claws and hoofs and horns and wings, and caused these stronger creatures to do his bidding, to bring him food and drink; but no one said, "This herd is mine!"

Still common property, Mr. Roosevelt.

They learned the nature and use of iron. They gathered it from the hills and smelted it in the rude furnaces of the hillside, and from it made the tools and weapons which enabled these iron workers to become masters of the world; but, Mr. Roosevelt, around the doorway of that primitive furnace the striker was never heard and the outrage of the lockout was never known, or the private owner was never there; common ownership was the system then, Mr. Roosevelt.

Rice and barley, wheat and corn, rye, oats, peas, beans and onions, gold and silver, iron, tin, brass and bronze, the scythe, the pruning knife, the spindle, shuttle and loom, the harp and the shepherd's pipe, the dyke, the ditch and irrigation channel, garments of cloth, and shoes of leather, and houses of stone; the dog, the goat, cow, hog and horse, the wagon of four wheels, the basket, mill and bakery—and "the white-winged ships, such as come down from the sea"—these, Mr. Roosevelt, were among the things man had contrived and learned to use during the years which modern scholarship calls years of savagery and barbarism. During all these years, Mr. Roosevelt, the private ownership of the means of life was never known.

About this time several new tools were devised and this revolutionized society.

After that the Phoenicians gave the world an alphabet. This was civilization's birthday, and the kid looked up and smiled with a written record in its hand.

But civilization brought us more than that. The idea of private property or its dominance as a passion over every other passion marks the commencement of civilization.

With the introduction and establishment of private
property came war; with war slavery and thirst for dominion and power, and for nearly six thousand years it has been written in blood and fire over the smoking centuries—"the system of private property is the root of all evil."

You, Mr. Roosevelt, stand like a stone wall for private ownership and deny that the human race ever made even a first step forward in the development of the race.

Either you are ignorant concerning the facts of history, or you are deliberately trying to deceive the people.

Even the novices of political science and history are laughing you to scorn.

But, Mr. Roosevelt, the day of private property in the means of life is drawing to a close. In spite of your Herculean efforts to continue this damnable system the people themselves will soon establish Socialism, and then and not until then will the wage-workers know the meaning of peace and plenty.

ROOSEVELT AND HIGH AUTHORITIES.

Roosevelt has proven that Socialism means free love, dividing up, dead-level of humanity, anti-private property, anti-christianity, etc., etc.

In rebuttal the Socialists quote from the leading encyclopedias, dictionaries, and world-famous authors. While these authorities are correctly quoted, I wish to call the reader's attention to the fact that the people prefer to accept the up-to-date interpretation as given by Roosevelt.

"The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity."—Encyclopedia Britiannica.

In the face of this great authority how dare you, Mr. Roosevelt, state that Socialism is anti-religious?

"Socialism is simply applied christianity; the Golden Rule applied to the every day life."—Professor Ely.

How about this testimony, Teddy?

"Socialism is a theory of society that advocates a more precise, orderly and harmonious arrangement of the social relations of mankind than that which has hitherto prevailed."—Webster's Dictionary.

Does that seem to you, Theodore, as if it would bust up the home?

"Socialism is a word having two distinct but related meanings. Primarily it is used as a name of a certain philosophy of history and method of interpreting and analyzing social phenomena. In the second place, since this philosophy and method have as one of their principal conclusions that society is evolving toward a co-operative stage, the
word is used to designate a co-operative social organization where the means for the production and distribution of wealth are the collective property of the workers, while the goods which are to be consumed become the private property of the individual."—Encyclopedia Americana.

The above definition Mr. Roosevelt especially declares that under Socialism there will be both public and private property and gives the lie to your statement that there could be no private property under Socialism. All the encyclopedias, dictionaries and standard authorities agree with the above definitions, Mr. Roosevelt. Either you have never studied Socialism or you are presuming upon the ignorance of the masses when you slander Socialism. In either case you are unworthy of the respect of the people.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

To Theodore Roosevelt, more than to any other man, belongs the great honor of having successfully launched the digging of the Panama Canal. Yet the ungrateful Socialists would rob Roosevelt of all glory in the canal by calling it a Socialist venture.

One of the chief Socialist blatherskites takes Roosevelt to task using the following coarse words:

"Isn't it a fact, Mr. Roosevelt, that the construction of the Panama Canal is being done by the national government? Isn't it a fact that the government has nearly forty thousand (40,000) employes on the job? Isn't it also true that in digging the Panama Canal the government built, owns and operates railroads, ice plants, electric powerhouses, laundries, cold storage plants, machine shops, hotels, opera houses, slaughter houses, parks, schools, club-rooms, billiard halls, Y. M. C. A.'s, Y. W. C. A.'s, and thirteen department stores, not to mention a long list of minor things necessary for the comfort and pleasure of the forty thousand (40,000) government employes now at work on the great Canal job?"

That your memory may be refreshed, Mr. Roosevelt, I quote from the official Canal report dated June, 1907:

"Fifteen hotels are being operated by the government for white Americans, where good, wholesome meals are furnished for 30 cents each.

Eighteen hotels are conducted by the government for European laborers, where meals are furnished for 40 cents.

"Twenty-three hotels and boarding houses for negroes, with meals at 30 cents.

"The number of meals served by the government dur-
ing the month was nearly a million.  

“All these hotels are conducted to furnish meals at cost. They are self-supporting, and no effort is made to obtain a profit.”

(Since the above was published by the government the force employed by the nation to dig the Canal has nearly doubled).

The Panama Canal report for 1908 says:

“Through its thirteen branch stores, located along the more important points on the Canal, the government supplies ice, meats, bread, pies, cakes, ice cream, groceries of all kinds, as well as laundry service. The value of commodities sold during the year aggregated $4,735,607.11.

“An average of 642 employes were carried on the rolls of the store department at an annual cost of $430,343.75.”

Isn’t it a fact, Mr. Roosevelt, that anything whatsoever that a family uses in the line of food, shelter and clothing is furnished at cost, and that the price charged by the government in the Canal zone is much less than at any retail store in the United States for the same grade of commodities? Isn’t it a fact that the government can undersell all private stores and concerns because it buys and sells direct, and thus cuts out the wholesaler, jobber, middleman, agents, advertising, bad debts, etc., etc.? Isn’t it a fact that if the government also manufactured its own goods instead of patronizing the trusts, that it would save to the people all the profits now made by the modern robber barons—the Rockefellers, the Morgans, the Carnegies, the Armours and the whole army of lesser trust magnates? Mr. Roosevelt, the Socialists would add to your Panama experiment the things embraced in this fundamental Socialistic idea: “Whatever the people use in common they should own in common, and whatever the people use privately they should own privately. If, therefore, to the above be added Direct Legislation—the Initiative, Referendum and Recall—you will have pure Socialism.”

But you, Mr. Roosevelt, prefer to let the trust own the factories, mines, railroads, land, etc., and thus permit them to grow fat at the people’s expense.

Why is it, Mr. Roosevelt, that you adopt Socialism on the Panama Canal job but fight it tooth and toe nail in the United States? This is where we Socialists absolutely prove that you are hand in glove with the money power of the world.

The Spanish war demonstrated the great necessity for the Canal. If the American trusts were ever to be the dom-
inant world power, the Panama Canal must be dug at once. The French had lost hundreds of millions in vainly trying to dig it. No private contractors offered to dig it for less than a half dozen times its actual cost. Advertise as much as the government could, yet no satisfactory bidders appeared. Then and only then did the government plan to dig the Canal itself. The yellow fever and other plagues killed off the workers as fast as they entered the tropical fever pest-hole at Panama. Sanitary experts were employed by the government and in a few years had the Canal Zone so sanitary that the death rate is today less than any American city.

Let Col. Gorgas, who is employed by the government and has charge of the sanitation department at Panama, state the case himself. In his official report he says: "I have the honor to report that during this month there has been no case of yellow fever, smallpox, cholera or the plague on the Canal Zone. The statistics I submit herewith show a grateful decrease in the sick rate of pneumonia and malaria over the preceding months, and is considerably lower than for the same month in any other year since the American occupation."

Socialists have always maintained that the government—the people—could do things cheaper and better than private concerns. The following from the Canal Zone Report of June, 1907, proves the Socialist argument:

"Over 600 horses and mules, with the necessary wagons, carts, carriages and ambulances, are in the service. In this connection it is interesting to note that the cost per month per team to the Canal Commissioners for teams actually working, including all charges for labor, forage and miscellaneous items, as well as expense for sick teams, was about $110,000. A proposal was received recently by the Canal Commission from a contractor in the United States, who has had considerable experience in similar work in South America, to do all land transportation at the rate o $450 per month per team, or over four times what it is costing the government at the present time."

Not only was it next to impossible to get private contractors to tackle the Canal job at any price, but the government found ice, meats, and all commodities selling at prices several times as high as American quotations. Only as a matter of absolute necessity did the government open its department stores and furnish goods at 10 per cent above American wholesale prices.
The government realized that to get American labor to tackle the job it must not only pay them well, but it must feed, clothe, shelter, entertain, educate and amuse them in first-class shape or they would not stay, neither would Americans stay if compelled to pay the old-fashioned high prices. Hence the government was compelled to run a complete little world of its own in the Canal Zone along Socialistic lines. Mr. Roosevelt, your government either manufactures or handles everything to be found in an up-to-date American city at prices less than in America, yet it is self-sustaining.

Another Socialistic feature is that no money is used at the government stores. Government coupons are used instead. This is equivalent to the proposed Socialistic "labor time check."

Mr. Roosevelt, you have been harping against the Socialists from many angles. One of your stock arguments is that a Socialist government could not procure special talent at any price. Yet when you desired to find a remedy for yellow fever and the plague, so prevalent in the Canal Zone, did not many able men volunteer? Did not Doctors Carroll and Lazear permit themselves to be experimented upon, realizing that death would almost surely follow? Did not Doctor Lazear die as a result of said experiment? And later did not General Leonard Wood offer a purse of $200 for each private who would submit himself to the yellow fever test? The first two men to offer up their lives for the uplift of the human race were from Ohio, Mr. Moran and Mr. Kissinger.

Notwithstanding that these two heroes were penniless, they refused the two hundred dollars reward offered by the government and proudly offered their lives free.

Such men as these two Ohio boys, Mr. Roosevelt, will be properly honored by the future Socialist nation while you, who love to shoot fleeing Spaniards in the back and denounce Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone as criminals, even while on trial for their lives, will be forgotten and buried in the rubbish of oblivion.

We thank you, Mr. Roosevelt, for your little Socialist nation of 40,000 people on the Canal Zone. It affords us Socialists proof that even a capitalistic government can make a success of co-operation, even in the midst of capitalism. When the same plan is put into full national operation by those who believe in it—the Socialists—then will it blossom into a full reality, and we will have the co-operative commonwealth.
Mr. Roosevelt, you admit that Socialism is a huge success in the Canal Zone, because it enables the workers to get their commodities at about half what the trusts charge the people in the United States, besides it has made living conditions wholesome in what was formerly a pest hole.

Since Socialism has proven such a blessing to 40,000 people on the Canal Zone why should 90,000,000 Americans be denied the blessings of Socialism?

It's up to you Teddy.

PRINCES OF PRIVILEGE.

It is not enough to rid ourselves of a king in government and an autocrat in church and a hierarchy in education, leaving untouched the kings of finance, the barons of industry, and the princes of privilege in general. To leave these privileged individuals alone is to give them the necessary economic power to take unto themselves the rule in government, church and school. The process is inevitable. We must go forward toward democracy in industry or backward toward autocracy in government, church and school. We simply cannot escape.

THE DRONES AND THE BEES.

"Hitherto it is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being. They have enabled a greater population to live the same life of drudgery and imprisonment, and an increased number of manufacturers, and others, to make large fortunes."—John Stuart Mill.

The negro slave of antebellum days has had his sufferings protrayed in novel, song and frenzied oratory. We have heard of the whip, the bloodhounds and all the paraphernalia used to force him to greater exertions.

We rejoice today that these things no longer exist.

But the South in the days of chattel slavery never saw what the wealthy North and South are alike seeing today—MILLIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN AND CHILDREN BEGGING FOR A CHANCE TO BE SLAVES.

“Our whole species falls into three great classes—useful labor, useless labor and idleness. Of these the FIRST ONLY is meritorious, and to it ALL the product of labor rightfully belongs. But the two latter, while they exist, are heavy PENSIONERS upon the first, robbing it of a large proportion of its just rights.”—Abraham Lincoln.
THE COMPETITIVE PLAN.

Even the poetically inclined Socialist delights in slur-ring Roosevelt for his effort in trying to rid the Republican party of its many evil practices. Reform rather than REV-OLUTION is Roosevelt’s plan.

The slander of the would-be Socialist poet follows:
An employer inserted a note in “The Post”
That he needed some workmen—a couple at most—
And found himself soon in the midst of a host.

“My friends,” he said, in hiring a man,
“Of course, I must get him as cheap as I can—
For that’s the approved, Competitive plan.”

Said one, “I’ve a wife and children three;
My aged mother is living with me;
I need twelve dollars a week,” said he.

“I’ve a wife and child,” the next one said;
“My mother, thank God, is long ago dead;
Ten dollars a week will buy our bread.”

“I’ve only a wife,” said the third; “and hence—
Our living involves a smaller expense;
“I’ll take nine dollars as my recompense.”

“My wife each week earns a dollar or two,”
Said the next: “If I were to work for you
About eight dollars a week would do.”

“I have no wife,” said the next; “I stay
With my parents, who board me without any pay;
So I will work for a dollar a day.”

Said the next, in a tone most meek and subdued:
“For twenty-four hours I’ve tasted no food;
I’ll take four dollars with gratitude.”

The next one said, “I’m a heathen Chinee;
I learned to live cheaply far over the sea;
Three dollars a week is sufficient for me.”

Thereupon to the crowd the employer spake:
“The lower wages you’re willing to take,
The larger, of course, are profits I make.
"Two workmen are all I at present require;  
The two that spoke last are the men I will hire—  
So the rest of the crowd may as well retire."

The unhired men began to entreat:  
"We've nothing to do, and nothing to eat;  
Must we and our families die in the street?"

"Aye, some of you must, if the rest would thrive;  
Too many of you are at present alive,  
And only the fittest can survive:

"And he is the fittest, beyond dispute,  
The present competitive system to suit,  
Whose life comes nearest to that of a brute.

"You ought to remember you only exist  
For the purpose of grinding some other man's grist,  
And swelling the gains of the capitalist.

"The coarsest of food to nourish you while  
Your master is daily increasing his pile,  
That he may revel in royal style—

"Some wretched hovel in which to dwell—  
If you get these you are doing well,  
For a worker, in the competitive Hell."

—J. L. McCreery.

Socialism will make it as hard for the rich to get into  
good society as the Bible makes it for them to get into  
Heaven. Then you, with your millions, will be in a hell of  
of a fix, won't you Teddy?

On the one side unearned riches in abundance, on the  
other hand unearned poverty, also in abundance. That  
gives you a picture of society under capitalism. How beau-  
tiful, how noble, how just.

CENSUS BULLETIN NO. 150.

Do you know that according to Census Bulletin  
No. 150 the average skilled mechanic creates $2,471.00  
worth of goods per year, and receives in wages only  
$437? Is this justice?
WHO ARE THE TRAITORS?

Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican, says:
"Government power should be concentrated in the hands of a very few men, who would be so conspicuous that no citizen could help knowing all about them, and the elections should not come so frequently." Abraham Lincoln says:
"We should all be bound by the majority of the American people.
"I REITERATE THAT THE MAJORITY SHOULD RULE.
"While the people retain their virtue and vigilance, NO ADMINISTRATION, by any extreme wickedness or folly can very seriously injure the government in the short space of four years!"
(See Lincoln's words on living questions, p. 70).
Archbishop John Ireland, a Republican, says:
"The hour may come when America will say: 'I must have order at any cost; if not with liberty, then with a powerful centralized government!'"
Abraham Lincoln says:
"Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism!" (See Lincoln's words on living questions, p. 150, by H. S. Taylor).
George Washington said:
"Toward the preservation of your government and the permanency of your happy state, it is requisite that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious its pretext."
(See messages and papers of presidents, Vol. 1, p. 218)
Woodrow Wilson, Democrat, says:
"Leadership of government are infinitely complex questions.
"Masses of men cannot be self-directed; neither can groups of communities.
"Questions of government are infinitely complex questions and no multitude can of themselves form clear cut, comprehensive, consistent conclusions touching them.
"Neither legislation nor administration can be done at the ballot box." (Political essays, p. 128, Chap. IV.)
Abraham Lincoln says:
"One point (of our popular government) still remains—
its successful maintenance against a formidable international attempt to overthrow it. It is now for them to demonstrate to the world that ballots are the rightful and peaceful successors of bullets, and that when ballots have fairly and constitutionally decided, there can be no successful appeal back to bullets, that there can be no successful appeal except to ballots themselves at succeeding elections.” (Annual message, Lincoln’s words on living questions, p. 76).

“To give the victory to the right, no bloody bullets, but peaceful ballots only, are necessary. Thanks to our good, old constitution, and organization under it, these alone are necessary.

“It only needs that every right thinking man shall go to the polls and, without fear of prejudice, vote as he thinks.” (Complete works, Vol. I, p. 427).

The majority shall rule. Socialism tolerates no leaders. The basic political principles of Socialism are the initiative, referendum and recall. Socialists contend that without these real democracy is impossible.

“METHODS OF ACQUIRING THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION.”

Admitting, for the sake of argument, the desirability of Socialism, Roosevelt, Bryan, Taft and others have shown how utterly impossible it would be to take over the giant industries, railroads, etc., as the Socialists propose.

The capitalists are in full possession of practically all the means of life. Not only do they have possession, but they have the police, the courts, the army and navy at their beck and call. Besides, they have the “Dick Military Law,” by means of which they can compel every man in the United States between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years to join the army and thus shoot down you fools when you wish to rob the millionaires of their hard-earned property. Socialists should know that not all the money in the world is sufficient to pay for these industries.

To all of this the Socialists put forth their oft exploded theory quoted below:

“It is not for any Socialist, here and now, to say how industries are to be acquired under Socialism. That will be decided by the people of that day by direct vote—through the initiative and referendum. Any deal made by the Socialists will be effective, being a majority vote. (Since it is proper that majorities should rule).
The army and navy today are obeying the order of the capitalists to defend their property, because the capitalists are in power. Socialists declare that the army and navy will defend the workers as against the capitalists, because then the SOCIALISTS will be in power. (Fine anarchistic dope, eh?)

When you elect Socialists to power you have settled for all times ONE point, and one point only, viz: You have decided to acquire the industries somehow. But you have not decided how.

Bear in mind that there are and can be but four methods of acquiring industries, etc., viz:

1. Purchase (That is, buy the industries and pay for them as in ordinary business).
2. Confiscation. (That is, take without pay).
3. Competition. (That is, build new factories, railroads, and compete the old ones out of business).
4. Pension. (That is, just as we now pension the old and worthy soldier).

Having elected the Socialists to power and thereby decided to take the industries, etc., the people will then proceed to discuss thoroughly which of these four methods should be used so as to create the least disturbance and render the greatest good to the greatest number.

The Non-Socialists, together with the Socialists, will then proceed to vote for their choice of the four methods.

Let us suppose the purchase method to have received the largest number of votes, which means that we are to proceed at once to buy industries, starting in with Rockefeller's Standard Oil Company. Suppose, further, that I was appointed to act as agent for the new Socialist commonwealth and forthwith called John D. to the witness stand. I would proceed to question him as follows:

Question:—John, when you were recently arrested in Chicago, tried, convicted, and fined $29,240,000 for having formed the oil trust, didn't you swear that the Standard Oil Company was capitalized at $96,000,000, and that the net profit during one year was $84,000,000; and isn't it a fact that two-thirds of this $96,000,000 is pure water?

Answer: Yes; sure.

Now, then, John D., the American people by direct vote have authorized me to purchase the oil company of you and issue therefore a United States bond drawing 4 per cent interest per annum during your natural lifetime—said bond to be null and void at your death.
Now of course, John, while you and your crowd formerly had a yearly income of $84,000,000, from now on you fellows will receive only $4,000,000 per year, but we, the American people, who do all the work, will save $80,000,000 per year, and in one and one-fourth years we will have you all paid off. Are you satisfied with this arrangement, John?

John D.'s answer: "De-e-e-elighted. It has been a great burden to me for years. I have been trying to ease my conscience by giving away millions of my ill-gotten gains to charity, universities, etc. I am fully aware that all wealth is the result of mental and physical labor and rightfully belongs to the producers—the people—all the people. I am especially gratified at the good sense displayed by the people in taking over for common good all those things on which society collectively depends for a living. In this way only will EQUAL OPPORTUNITY be guaranteed to all mankind forever."

Who can doubt that John D. and other plutocrats are anxiously awaiting just such a deal?

And now, dear reader, every industry in the entire country can be acquired in the same easy way, inside of five years, and still keep every train running on schedule time. In this way industries can be purchased, not by what the people earn, but what they save by virtue of being themselves the owners.

And, finally, do you really believe in "equal opportunity for all? If so, you are compelled to annul the right of inheritance. Otherwise the children of the propertyless are, from birth, the hirings of those who inherit wealth. If we add to the four methods above the "annulment of inheritance", as a result, in one generation alone, the chief means of livelihood will have been restored to the people, its rightful owners.

P. S. Since writing the above I have received the following communication from John D.:

My Dear Comrade, "Men and Mules": Kindly convey this idea to the readers of Socialist press, viz: Had the people voted for "Confiscation" rather than purchase, I should have said amen to it, because it would only have been "restitution" after all.

I came to this conclusion after carefully looking over thousands of titles and deeds to the billions of property which I held, because I found not God's signature to a single one of them.

Yours for Socialism in our time

JOHN D.
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No matter whose lips that speak, they must be free and un gagged. Let us believe that the whole truth can never do harm to the whole of virtue; and remember that in order to get the whole truth you must allow every man, right or wrong, freely to utter his conscience, and to protect him in so doing. Entire, unshackled freedom for every man's life, no matter what his doctrine—the safety of free discussion, no matter how wide its range. The community which dares not protect its humblest and most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.

—Wendell Phillips
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